











September, 1829.

# S E R M O N S

PRINTED FOR AND SOLD BY

C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

---

## NEW VOLUMES, AND NEW EDITIONS.

**ARNOLD.**—SERMONS. By the Rev. Thomas Arnold, D.D. Head Master of Rugby School, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**WALKER.**—SERMONS on various Subjects and Occasions. By the Rev. James Walker, D.D. of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Episcopal Professor of Theology at Edinburgh. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**WIX.**—PRACTICAL SERMONS on the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes, adapted to Family Reading. With two Sermons on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. By Samuel Wix, A.M. F.R.S. and A.S. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

**HORNE.**—The RELIGIOUS NECESSITY of the REFORMATION asserted, and the Extent to which it was carried in the Church of England vindicated. In Eight Sermons, preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1828. By Thomas Horne, B.D. Rector of St. Catherine Coleman, and formerly Student of Christ Church. 8vo. 8s.

**FRASER.**—SERMONS on the Lives of some of the first Promulgators of Christianity, and on Miscellaneous Subjects, preached in the Parish of Bromley, Middlesex. By the Rev. Peter Fraser, M.A. Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Chaplain to his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge. 8vo. 8s.

**CRESSWELL.**—SERMONS on Domestic Duties. By the Rev. Daniel Cresswell, D.D. Vicar of Enfield, Middlesex. 12mo. 5s.

**HAGGITT.**—SERMONS. By the Rev. John Haggitt, Rector of Ditton, near Cambridge. 8vo. 8s.

**WILLIS.**—SERMONS for Servants. By the Rev. W. Downes Willis, M.A. Vicar of Kirkby in Cleveland. 12mo. 6s.

**BAKER.**—The GERMAN PULPIT; being a Collection of Sermons by the most eminent modern Divines of Germany. Selected and Translated by the Rev. R. Baker, Chaplain to the British Factory at Hamburgh. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**LAUD.**—SERMONS, preached by William Laud, D.D. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of the University of Oxford. Reprinted verbatim from the last Edition in 1651, and Edited by the Rev. J. W. Hatherell, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**SHUTTLEWORTH.**—SERMONS on some of the leading Principles of Christianity. By Philip Nicholas Shuttleworth, D.D. Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley, Wilts. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 12s.

---

**ALISON.**—SERMONS on the Seasons. By Archibald Alison, LL.B. Prebendary of Sarum, Rector of Roddington, Vicar of High Ercal, and Senior Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, York Place, Edinburgh. 12mo. 3s.

**ASPINAL.**—SERMONS, Doctrinal and Practical. By the Rev. James Aspinall, A.M., Chaplain of St. Michael's, Liverpool. 3 vols. 8vo. Price 8s. each in boards. (*sold separately.*)

**ATTERBURY.** BP.—SERMONS and DISCOURSES on several Subjects and Occasions. By the late Francis Atterbury, D.D. Lord Bishop of Rochester. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.

**BARROW.**—FAMILIAR SERMONS on several of the Doctrines and Duties of the Christian Religion. By the Rev. William Barrow, LL.D. and F.A.S., Prebendary of Southwell, and Vicar of Farnsfield. 3 vols. 8vo. 11. 11s. 6d.

- BEAN.**—**PAROCHIAL INSTRUCTION**, or Sermons delivered from the Pulpit, at different Times in the course of Thirty Years. By the late James Bean, M.A., Assistant Minister of Welbeck Chapel. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- BELL.**—**SERMONS** on various Subjects, by the late William Bell, D.D., Prebendary of Westminster. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.
- BERENS.**—**THIRTY-THREE VILLAGE SERMONS**, on the chief Articles of Faith, and the means of Grace, on certain Parts of the Christian Character, and on some of the Relative Duties. By the Rev. Edward Berens, M.A. late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. New Edition, in 1 vol. 12mo. 4s. 6d.
- BERKELEY.**—**SERMONS** by the late Rev. George Berkeley, LL.D. Prebendary of Canterbury. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- BEVERIDGE, BP.**—**SERMONS** selected and abridged from the Works of Bishop Beveridge. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.
- BOUCHER.**—**SERMONS** by the late Rev. John Boucher, M.A. Vicar of Kirknewton, and Rector of Shaftesbury. 12mo. 7s.
- BOUDIER.**—**PLAIN and PRACTICAL SERMONS.** By the Rev. John Boudier, A.M. Vicar of St. Mary's, Warwick. 8vo. 9s.
- BRAY.**—**SERMONS** selected from the Works of the most eminent Divines of the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries, abridged, and rendered in an appropriate Style. By the Rev. E. A. Bray, B.D. Vicar of Tavistock. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- **DISCOURSES**, adapted to the Pulpit, or to the Use of Families, from Treatises of eminent Divines. By the same Author. 8vo. 8s.
- BUSFELD.**—**SERMONS** on the most important Duties of the Christian Religion, the Lord's Prayer, and on the Great Mystery. By J. A. Busfeld, D.D. Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Mulgrave, Rector of St. Michael's, Woodstreet. 3 vols. 8vo. 11. 16s.
- \* \* The Third Volume may be had separate.
- CARR.**—**SERMONS ON PRACTICAL SUBJECTS.** By the late Rev. Samuel Carr, D.D. Rector of Finchley, Middlesex. 3 vols. 8vo. 11. 7s.
- CASSAN.**—**SERMONS**, designed to correct some of the principal Errors of the present Times, and to promote Christian Unity and Church Membership. By the Rev. Stephen Hyde Cassan, A.M., Curate of Mere Wilts, &c. 8vo. 12s.
- CHANDLER.**—**The SCHEME OF DIVINE REVELATION** considered, principally in its Connection with the Progress and Improvement of Human Society; in Eight Sermons, at the Bampton Lecture in 1825. By the Rev. George Chandler, LL.D. late Fellow of New College, Rector of Southam, Warwickshire, and Rector of All Souls, St. Mary-le-bone. 8vo. 8s.
- CHARTERS.**—**SERMONS** by Samuel Charters, D.D. Minister of Wilton. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.
- CHEVALLIER.**—**On the HISTORICAL TYPES** contained in the OLD TESTAMENT. Twenty Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge, at the Hulsean Lecture in 1826. By the Rev. Temple Chevallier, M.A. late Fellow and Tutor at Catherine Hall. 8vo. 12s.
- **TWENTY DISCOURSES** on the Proofs of Divine Power and Wisdom derived from the Study of Astronomy, and on the Evidence, Doctrines, and Precepts of Revealed Religion, preached before the University of Cambridge, at the Hulsean Lecture in 1827. By the same Author. 8vo. 12s.
- CLAPP.**—**SERMONS** on the Practical Duties of Christianity: for Families. By the Rev. John Clapp, M.A. late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford; and Vicar of Long Benton, Northumberland. *Second Edition.* 3 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.
- CLAY.**—**TWENTY-FIVE SERMONS**, preached to the Inmates of a Gaol, and in a great degree adapted to a Country Congregation. By the Rev. John Clay, Chaplain to the House of Correction, Freston. 12mo. 6s.
- COBBE.**—**THIRTY SERMONS**, on various Subjects. By Richard Chaloner Cobbe, D.D. Vicar of St. Anne's, in Ireland. 2 vols. 8vo. 10s.
- COLE.**—**SIXTEEN SERMONS** on Practical and Doctrinal Subjects. By the Rev. B. T. H. Cole, A.M. Rector of Warbleton, Sussex. 8vo. 8s.

**COLLINSON.**—A KEY to the Writings of the principal Fathers of the Christian Church who flourished during the First Three Centuries. In Eight Sermons at the Bampton Lecture in 1813. By the Rev. John Collinson, M.A. Rector of Gateshead, Durham. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**DARNELL.**—SERMONS. By W. N. Darnell, B.D. Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Norham, Durham. 8vo. 9s.

**DAUBENY.**—SCRIPTURE ITS OWN INTERPRETER; in a Series of Discourses, tending to prove from the Connexion between the Old and New Testament, that the Doctrines of Unitarianism, as it is called, are totally irreconcilable with the general tenor of Divine Revelation. By the late Rev. Charles Daubeny, LL.D. Archdeacon of Sarum. The Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

———— DISCOURSES on various Subjects and Occasions. By the same Author. 8vo. 9s.

———— DISCOURSES on several Subjects. By the same Author. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**DEHON, BP.**—SERMONS on the Public Means of Grace; the Fasts and Festivals of the Church; on Scripture Characters, and various Practical Subjects. By the late Right Rev. Theodore Dehon, D.D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in South Carolina. Together with some Account of the Author, and a Sermon preached on Occasion of his Death. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.

**D'OYLY.**—SERMONS, chiefly doctrinal, with Notes. By George D'OYLY, D.D. F.R.S. Rector of Lambeth; and of Sundridge, Kent. 8vo. 12s.

**DRUMMOND, ABP.**—SERMONS on Public Occasions, and a Letter on Theological Study. By Robert, late Archbishop of York; with Memoirs of his Life. By G. H. Drummond, A.M. Prebendary of York. 8vo. 5s.

**DRYSDALE.**—SERMONS. By the late Rev. John Drysdale, B.D. F.R.S. Edin. one of the Ministers of Edinburgh. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

**EIGHTEEN SERMONS**, intended to establish the inseparable Connexion between the Doctrine and Practice of Christianity; dedicated to the Bishop of Salisbury. 12mo. 5s.

**EIGHTEEN ADDITIONAL SERMONS**, on the same Subject. 12mo. 5s.

**FABER.**—SERMONS on various Subjects and Occasions. By George Stanley Faber, B.D. Rector of Long Newton. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 4s.

———— **HORÆ MOSAICÆ**, or a Dissertation on the Credibility and Theology of the Pentateuch, comprehending the Substance of Eight Lectures, read at the Bampton Lecture in 1801. By the same Author. The Second Edition, revised, altered, and augmented. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 4s.

**FARQUHAR.**—SERMONS on various Subjects. By the late John Farquhar, M.A. Minister at Nigg. 8vo. 6s.

**FARRER.**—SERMONS on the PARABLES. By the late Rev. John Farrer, M.A. Rector of St. Clement, Eastcheap. 8vo. 9s.

———— SERMONS on the Mission and Character of Christ, and on the Beatitudes, comprehending what were preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1803. By the same Author. 8vo. 7s.

**FORSTER.**—SERMONS upon various Subjects, delivered at Tunbridge Wells. By the Rev. T. Forster, late Minister at that Chapel. 2 vols. 8vo. 10s.

**FRANCKLIN.**—SERMONS on the Relative Duties. By the late Thomas Francklin, D.D. Rector of Brasted, Kent. 8vo. 5s.

**FRANKS.**—TWENTY SERMONS on the Apostolical Preaching and Vindication of the Gospel to the Jews, Samaritans, and devout Gentiles; as exhibited in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Preached before the University of Cambridge, in the year 1823, at the Lecture founded by the late Rev. John Hulse, of St. John's College. By J. C. Franks, M.A. Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Vicar of Huddersfield, Yorkshire. 1 vol. 8vo. 12s.

———— THE HULSEAN LECTURES for 1821; Twenty Sermons on the Evidences of Christianity, as they were stated and enforced in the Discourses of our Lord. By the same Author. 8vo. 12s.

- GARDINER.**—SERMONS on various Subjects, preached at the Octagon Chapel, Bath. By the Rev. John Gardiner, D.D. Rector of Brailsford, and Vicar of Shirley, in the County of Devon. Second Edition. 8vo. 8s.
- GARROW.**—SERMONS, comprising various Matters of Doctrine and Practice. By the late Rev. D. W. Garrow, D.D. of Christ Church, Oxford, and Rector of East Barnet, Herts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- GERY.**—NINE SERMONS preached on several Occasions. By Hugh Wade Gery, M.A. Rector of Thurning, in the County of Huntingdon. 8vo. 6s.
- GILSON.**—SERMONS ON PRACTICAL SUBJECTS. By the late David Gilson, M.A. Curate of St. Saviour's, Southwark. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.
- GLEIG, BP.**—SERMONS preached occasionally in the Episcopal Church, Stirling, during the eventful Period from 1793 to 1803. By the Right Rev. Bishop Gleig, LL.D. F.R.S.E. and F.S.S.A. 8vo. 7s.
- GRAVES.**—SELECT SCRIPTURAL PROOFS of the TRINITY, arranged in Four Discourses; delivered in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin: to which are annexed, Notes and Illustrations. By the late Very Rev. Richard Graves, D.D. M.R.I.A. Dean of Ardagh, &c. 8vo. 7s.
- GRAVES.**—SERMONS on various Subjects. By the Rev. Richard Graves, M.A. late Rector of Claverton, Somerset. 8vo. 5s.
- GRAY, BP.**—DISCOURSES on various Subjects, illustrative of the Evidence, Influence, and Doctrines of Christianity. By the Right Rev. Robert Gray, D.D. Lord Bishop of Bristol, and Prebendary of Durham. 8vo. 6s.
- SERMONS on the Principles upon which the Reformation of the Church of England was established, preached at the Bampton Lecture, in 1796. By the same Author. 8vo. 6s.
- HAGGITT.**—SERMONS to COUNTRY CONGREGATIONS. By the late Rev. George Haggitt, A.B. Rector of Beechamwell, Norfolk. The Eighth Edition. In One Volume, 8vo. 9s.
- HAMPDEN.**—PAROCHIAL SERMONS, illustrative of the Importance of the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ. By the Rev. Renn D. Hampden, A.M., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
- HARDINGE.**—PLAIN DISCOURSES, Doctrinal and Practical, adapted to a Country Congregation. By the Rev. Sir Charles Hardinge, Bart. M.A. Vicar of Tunbridge, Kent. Second Edition, 12mo. 5s.
- HAYDEN.**—SERMONS. By the Rev. John Hayden, Curate of Londonderry. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- HETT.**—DISCOURSES on several Subjects and Occasions. By William Hett, M.A. In 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.
- HEWLETT.**—SERMONS on various Subjects. By the Rev. John Hewlett, B.D. and F.A.S. Rector of Hilgay, Norfolk. A new Edition, complete in 3 vols. 8vo. 11. 11s. 6d.
- \* \* The last Volume may be had separately, marked Vol. IV. to complete former Editions. Price 10s. 6d.
- HEYLYN.**—SELECT DISCOURSES on the principal Points of Natural and Revealed Religion. By the late John Heylyn, D.D. Prebendary of Westminster. 2 vols. 8vo. 1s.
- HOBART, BP.**—SERMONS on the principal Events and Truths of Redemption. To which are annexed, an Address and Dissertation on the State of the Departed, and the Descent of Christ into Hell. By John Henry Hobart, D.D. Bishop of the Episcopal Church, New York, &c. &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.
- HORNE, BP.**—The DISCOURSES of the late Right Reverend George Horne, D.D. Lord Bishop of Norwich. 3 vols. 8vo. 11. 4s.
- HOUGH, BP.**—SERMONS and CHARGES. By the Right Rev. John Hough, D.D. President of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford, in the Reign of James II. and successively Bishop of Oxford, Lichfield and Coventry, and Worcester. To which is prefixed, a Memoir of his Life. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- JONES.**—SERMONS on the COMMANDMENTS. By Robert Jones, D.D. Vicar of East Bedford, Middlesex. 8vo. 6s.

- JORTIN.**—SERMONS on different Subjects. By the late Rev. John Jortin, D.D. Archdeacon of London, and Rector of St. Dunstons in the East. To which are added, by the same Author, the Doctrine of a Future State, and Four Charges. New Edition. 4 vols. 8vo. 11. 16s.
- KETT.**—SERMONS preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1790. By the late Henry Kett, M.A. of Trinity College. 8vo. 7s.
- KIRWAN.**—SERMONS by the late Rev. Walter Blake Kirwan, Dean of Killala. With a Sketch of his Life, and Portrait. 8vo. 9s.
- LAURENCE, ABP.**—An Attempt to illustrate those ARTICLES of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical. In Eight Sermons at the Bampton Lecture in 1814. By the Most Rev. Richard Laurence, LL.D. Archbishop of Cashel. 8vo. 12s.
- LAYARD.**—SERMONS by the late Charles Peter Layard, D.D. F.R.S. and A.S. Dean of Bristol. 8vo. 12s.
- LEIGHTON, ABP.**—Eighteen SERMONS on various Subjects. By the late Archbishop Leighton. 8vo. 6s.
- LLOYD.**—DISCOURSES, chiefly Doctrinal, delivered in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin. By Bartholomew Lloyd, D.D. S.F.T.C.D. M.R.I.A. Professor of Mathematics in the University. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- LUSCOMBE, BP.**—SERMONS from the French; translated, abridged, and adapted to the English Pulpit. By the Right Rev. Bp. Luscombe, LL.D. 8vo. 9s.
- MACLAINE.**—Twenty-one DISCOURSES on various Subjects, delivered in the English Church at the Hague. By Archibald Maclaine, D.D. Member of some Foreign Academies. Second Edition. 8vo. 7s.
- MANNING.**—SERMONS ON IMPORTANT SUBJECTS. By the late Owen Manning, B.D. Prebendary of Lincoln. 2 vols in one. 8vo. 9s.
- MANT, BP.**—SERMONS for Parochial and Domestic Use, designed to illustrate and enforce, in a connected View, the most important Articles of Christian Faith and Practice. By the Right Rev. Richard Mant, D.D. Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. 3 vols. 8vo. Fifth Edition. 11. 7s.
- An APPEAL to the GOSPEL, or an Inquiry into the Justice of the Charge alleged by Methodists and other Objectors, that the Gospel is not preached by the National Clergy; in a Series of Discourses delivered at the Bampton Lecture in 1812. By the same Author. 8vo. Sixth Edition. 12s.
- SERMONS on the LITURGY, and other Subjects, preached before the University of Oxford, in 1814, 15, and 16. By the same. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- MAYO.**—DISCOURSES on the PRINCIPLES of RELIGIOUS WORSHIP, and Subjects connected with them; particularly the Liturgy of the Church of England: with Notes, Illustrative and Explanatory. By the Rev. C. Mayo, LL.B. Rector of Bechingstoke and Huish, Wilts. 8vo. 7s.
- DISCOURSES on the INTERNAL EVIDENCE of CHRISTIANITY, as displayed in the Connexion of Natural and Revealed Religion, the Immortality of the Soul, and a Future State. With an Appendix, relating to the Religion and Conversion of the Hindoos. By the same Author. 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- MOLESWORTH.**—SERMONS on various Subjects; with an Appendix, containing an Examination of certain supposed Points of Analogy between Baptism and Circumcision. By the Rev. J. E. N. Molesworth, A.M. formerly of Trinity College, Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- MOREHEAD.**—Thirty-four OCCASIONAL SERMONS. By the Rev. R. Morehead, A.M. of Balliol College, Oxford, and Junior Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, York Place, Edinburgh. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- MORGAN.**—SERMONS on several Subjects. By the late John Pilkington Morgan, M.A. Vicar of Hitchin, Herts. 2 vols. small 8vo. 9s.
- MORGAN.**—A compressed VIEW of the RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES and PRACTICES of the AGE; or, a Trial of the Chief Spirits that are in the World, by the Standard of the Scriptures: attempted in Eight Sermons, at the Bampton Lecture in 1819. By Hector Davies Morgan, M.A. of Trinity College, Minister of Castle Hedingham, Essex, and Prebendary of Brecon. 8vo. 12s.



**MUNKHOUSE.**—SERMONS on various Subjects, chiefly practical. By the late Rev. R. Munkhouse, D.D. Vicar of Wakefield. 8vo. 8s.

**NANCE.**—SERMONS on various Subjects and Occasions. By the Rev. John Nance, D.D. Rector of Old Romney, Kent. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

**NARES.**—SERMONS on FAITH, and other Subjects. By the late Robert Nares, M.A. F.R.S. &c. Archdeacon of Stafford, Canon Residentiary of Lichfield, and Rector of Allhallows, London Wall. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

—DISCOURSES preached before the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn. By the same Author. 8vo. 7s.

—A CONNECTED and CHRONOLOGICAL VIEW of the Prophecies relating to the Christian Church, in Twelve Sermons, preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel, from the Year 1800 to 1804, at the Warburtonian Lecture. By the same Author. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

**NARES.**—DISCOURSES on the THREE CREEDS, and on the HOMAGE offered to OUR SAVIOUR, &c. &c. By Edward Nares, D.D. Rector of Bidenden, Kent. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**NOLAN.**—The OPERATIONS of the HOLY GHOST illustrated and confirmed by Scriptural Authorities, in a Series of Sermons, evincing the Wisdom and Consistency of the Economy of Grace: with Notes and Illustrations, &c. By the Rev. Frederic Nolan, LL.D. Vicar of Prittlewell. 8vo. 12s.

**O'BEIRNE, BP.**—SERMONS on important Subjects, and on several Occasions. By the late T. L. O'Beirne, D.D. Lord Bishop of Meath. 3 vols. 8vo. 11. 9s.

**OGILVIE.**—SERMONS on various Subjects. By the late James Ogilvie, D.D. Rector of Westover Parish, in Virginia. 8vo. 5s.

**OWEN.**—The INTENT and PROPRIETY of the SCRIPTURE MIRACLES considered and explained, in a Series of Sermons, preached at Boyle's Lecture, in the Years 1769, 1770, 1771. By the late Rev. Henry Owen, D.D. Rector of St. Olave, Hart Street. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

**PARRY.**—PAROCHIAL SERMONS, preached in the West Indies: to which are added, three Occasional Sermons. By Thomas Parry, M.A., Archdeacon of Antigua, and late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**PARTRIDGE.**—SERMONS, altered and adapted to an English Pulpit, from French Writers. By the late S. Partridge, M.A. Vicar of Boston. 8vo. 7s.

**PATTESON.**—SERMONS chiefly designed to display the Connection between a Sound Faith and a Holy Life. By the Rev. Edward Patteson, M.A. of East Sheen, Surry; formerly of Trinity College, Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**PLUMPTRE.**—A Popular COMMENTARY on the BIBLE, in a Series of Sermons, following, in the Old Testament, the Course of the First Lessons at Morning and Evening Service on Sundays. Designed for Parish Churches, or for Reading in Private Families. By the Rev. J. Plumptre, B.D. Vicar of Great Gransden. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 6s.

—FOUR DISCOURSES on Subjects relating to the Amusements of the Stage, preached at Cambridge, in 1808: with copious Notes. By the same Author. 8vo. 7s.

**POTT.**—A COURSE of SERMONS for the LORD'S DAY, throughout the Year, from the First Sunday in Advent to the Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, including Sermons for Christmas Day, the First Day in Lent, Good Friday, and Ascension Day; adapted to, and taken chiefly from the Service of the Day. By Joseph Holden Pott, A.M. Archdeacon of London, and Vicar of Kensington. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.

—A COURSE of SERMONS for the FESTIVALS and FASTS of the CHURCH of ENGLAND. By the same Author. 12s.

**PROCTER.**—FIVE DISCOURSES on the Personal Office of Christ and of the Holy Ghost; on the Doctrine of the Trinity, on Faith, and on Regeneration, with an Appendix. By the Rev. William Procter, Jun. M.A. Fellow of Catherine Hall, Cambridge, and Lecturer of Berwick. Small 8vo. 4s. 6d.

**PROWETT.**—SERMONS, Original and Translated. By the Rev. John Prowett, A.M. Rector of Edburton, Sussex. 8vo. 6s.

**RENNELL.**—DISCOURSES on various Subjects. By Thomas Rennell, D.D. Dean of Winchester. Second Edition. 8vo. 7s.

- RENNELL.**—SERMONS. By the late Thomas Rennell, B.D. F.R.S. Vicar of Kensington, and Prebendary of South Grantham, in the Church of Salisbury. Second Edition. 8vo. 12s.
- REVELL.**—SERMONS. By the Rev. Henry Revell, Curate of Coleford, Gloucestershire. 8vo. 12s.
- RIDDOCH.**—SERMONS on several Subjects and Occasions. By the late James Riddoch, A.M. one of the Ministers of St. Paul's Chapel, Aberdeen. 3 vols. 8vo. Fourth Edition. 11. 4s.
- ROBSON.**—SERMONS on various Subjects, selected from the MSS. of the late Rev. E. Robson, A.M. of Emanuel College, Cambridge, Vicar of Orston, and Lecturer of St. Mary, Whitechapel. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.
- ROSE.**—THE COMMISSION and CONSEQUENT DUTIES of the CLERGY, in a Series of Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge, in April, 1826. By Hugh James Rose, B.D., of Trinity College. 8vo. 8s.
- RUDGE.**—LECTURES, or PLAIN HISTORICAL SERMONS on the LEADING CHARACTERS and most important Events recorded in the Book of Genesis. By James Rudge, D.D. F.R.S. Rector of Haukchurch, Dorset. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.
- SANDFORD, BP.**—SERMONS, preached in St. John's Chapel, Edinburgh. By Daniel Sandford, D.D. one of the Bishops of the Scotch Episcopal Church, and formerly Student of Christ Church, Oxford. 8vo. 12s.
- SCATTERGOOD.**—Fifty-two SERMONS upon several Occasions. By Samuel Scattergood. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.
- SCOTT.**—SERMONS on interesting Subjects. By the late Rev. James Scott, D.D. Rector of Simonburn, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. To which is prefixed a Sketch of his Life. 8vo. 9s.
- SEABURY, BP.**—DISCOURSES on several Subjects. By the late Samuel Seabury, D.D. Bishop of Connecticut and Rhode-Island. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.
- SERMONS**, for Sunday Evenings, upon the TEN COMMANDMENTS. Second Edition, enlarged. 12mo. 4s. 6d.
- SIMS.**—SERMONS, partly illustrative of the Devotional Services of the Church of England. By the Rev. Thomas Sims, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to Her Grace the Duchess Dowager of Beaufort. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- SMITH.**—SERMONS on the most interesting Subjects of the Christian Religion. By the late Rev. H. Smith, D.D. Reader of the Temple and Lecturer of St. Margaret's, Westminster. Second Edition. 8vo. 5s.
- SMITH.**—SELECT DISCOURSES. By John Smith, late Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge. Third Edition. 8vo. 12s.
- SNOWDEN.**—SERMONS, Doctrinal, Practical, and Occasional. By the Rev. W. Snowden, Perpetual Curate of Horbury, near Wakefield. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.
- SPENCER.**—SERMONS on various Subjects. By the Hon. and Venerable Aubrey G. Spencer, LL.D. Archdeacon of Bermuda; Rector of Pagets and Warwick; and one of the Members of His Majesty's Council. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- SPRY.**—CHRISTIAN UNITY doctrinally and historically considered, in Eight Sermons, preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1817. By John Hume Spry, D.D. Rector of St. Mary-le-bone, and Prebendary of Canterbury. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- STEVENS.**—A SERIES of DISCOURSES on the Festivals and Fasts and other peculiar Days of the Church of England. By Brooke Bridges Stevens, M.A. of Jesus College, Cambridge. 8vo. 9s.
- STRONG.**—SIX DISCOURSES, preached before the University of Oxford. By Thomas Linwood Strong, B.D. Rector of Sedgely, Durham, and late Fellow of Oriel College. 8vo. 6s.
- SWAN.**—SERMONS on several Subjects; with Notes, Critical, Historical, and Explanatory: and an Appendix. By the Rev. Charles Swan, late of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**TILLOTSON. ABP.**—SERMONS, selected and abridged from the Works of Archbishop Tillotson. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l.

**VAN MILDERT, BP.**—AN HISTORICAL VIEW of the RISE and PROGRESS of INFIDELITY, with a Refutation of its Principles and Reasonings, in a Series of Sermons, preached for the Lecture founded by the Hon. R. Boyle, from the Year 1802 to 1805. By the Right Rev. William Van Mildert, DD. Lord Bishop of Durham. Third Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

---

— AN INQUIRY into the GENERAL PRINCIPLES of SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATION, in Eight Sermons, preached at the Bampton Lectures in 1814. By the same Author. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**VAUX.**—The Benefits annexed to a Participation in the Two CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS of BAPTISM and the LORD'S SUPPER, considered in Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford in the Year 1826; at the Lecture founded by the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A. Canon of Salisbury. By William Vaux, B.D. Domestic Chaplain to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and late Fellow of Balliol College. 8vo. 9s.

The **VILLAGE PREACHER**, a Collection of short plain Sermons: partly original, partly selected, and adapted to Village Instruction. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. In 5 vols. 12mo. price 5s. each.

\* \* Any Volume may be had separately.

**VINCENT.**—SERMONS on Practical Subjects. By John Vincent, A.B. late Chaplain to the Establishment at Fort William in Bengal. 8vo. 8s.

**WAIT.**—A COURSE of SERMONS preached before the University of Cambridge in the Year 1825. Illustrative of the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian Dispensations—of the Origin and Object of the Mosaic Ritual—of the Characters of Melchisedeck and St. John the Baptist—and of the Advent of our Saviour.—Accompanied with Critical Notes. By the Rev. Daniel Guildford Wait, LL.D. Member of St. John's College; Rector of Blagdon, Somersetshire; and Member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain. 8vo. 6s.

**WERNINCK.**—Twenty-four SERMONS on Practical Subjects, translated from the Works of the most eminent Dutch and French Protestant Ministers in Holland. By J. Werninck, D.D. F.R.S. Amst. and Middleb., Minister of the Dutch Church in London. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**WHITAKER.**—A COURSE of SERMONS upon Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell. By the late John Whitaker, B.D. Rector of Ruan Lanyhorne, Cornwall. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

**WHITE.**—A COMPARISON of MAHOMETANISM and CHRISTIANITY, in their History, their Evidence, and their Effects; in Eight Sermons, at the Bampton Lecture in 1784. By the late Joseph White, D.D. Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. 8vo. 12s.

**WHITE.**—SERMONS preached at Welbeck Chapel, St. Mary-le-Bone. By the Rev. Thomas White, M.A. Minister of that Chapel. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**WHITTAKER.**—JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. A Course of Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in January, 1825. By the Rev. John W. Whittaker, B.D. Vicar of Blackburn, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 8vo. 5s.

**WILSON, BP.**—Select SERMONS of the Right Rev. Thomas Wilson, D.D. Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man; abridged, and rendered in a familiar, but less colloquial style. By the Rev. Edward Atkyns Bray, B.D. F.A.S. Vicar of Tavistock. 12mo. 4s.

**WILSON.**—Practical SERMONS on Christian Duty. By the Rev. Plumptre Wilson, LL.B. Curate of Shepton Mallet. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**WORDSWORTH.**—SERMONS. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

**YOUNG.**—Three SERMONS on St. Paul's Doctrine of, 1. Justification by Faith; 2. Original Sin; 3. Predestination; with Notes. To the whole is prefixed a Synopsis of the Argument of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. Thomas Young, A.M. Rector of Gilling, late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. The Second Edition, revised and enlarged; dedicated, by Permission, to His Grace the Archbishop of York. 8vo. 9s.



THE

# British Critic,

## QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

AND

## ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

No. XII.—OCTOBER, 1829.

---

### ADVERTISEMENTS.

---

Lately published, in Eight Large Volumes, 8vo., price 6*l.* 2*s.* in boards,

**R**ECENSIO SYNOPTICA ANNOTATIONIS SACRÆ, being a Critical Digest and Synoptical Arrangement of the most important Annotations on the New Testament, Exegetical, Philological, and Doctrinal.

By the Rev. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, D.D. F.A.S.

Of Sidney College, Cambridge, Vicar of Bisbrooke in Rutland, and Author of a New Translation of THUCYDIDES, illustrated with very copious Notes. 3 vols. 8vo.

In the foregoing work it has been the especial aim of the Author to ascertain the true interpretation, not only by a diligent use of all the best Modern Commentators, but by exploring the fountain heads of interpretation, as found in the Ancient Fathers, and the Greek Commentators, Scholiasts, and Glossographers. Every apposite illustration of phraseology or sentiment to be found in the multifarious and immense Collectanea, both of the Classical and Rabbinical Illustrators, (especially Wetstein and Kyrke, Lightfoot and Schœtgen,) has been selected, and many thousands of original ones have been added. The very valuable matter derived from the above sources has been digested into one *Corpus*, in which each portion is, as far as possible, ascribed to its respective Author, and the Foreign matter translated into English. With the whole is interwoven a *series of critical remarks*, intended to guide the judgment of the student amidst the diversities of jarring interpretations, and a *very copious body of original annotations*, in which the true reading is, in important cases, discussed, the connexion traced, the course of reasoning indicated, and in general whatever seemed necessary to complete the *Corpus Exegeteos*, is supplied by the Editor, who has further consulted the benefit of Students by forming a *Series of Glossarial Notes* on every word or phrase of the least difficulty, and occasionally by giving a new literal translation, or close paraphrase of the sentences annotated on.

Printed for C. J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-yard and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall.

---

This day is published, in post 8vo. price 5*s.* in boards,

**T**HE REVELATION and INCARNATION of MITHRA; or a Sketch of the Sacred History of the Central World.

By a LAYMAN.

Printed for C. J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall.

Just published, in One Volume, 8vo. price 7s. boards,

**THE ARGUMENTS for PREDESTINATION and NECESSITY** contrasted with the established Principles of PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY. In Two Act Sermons, in Trinity College, Dublin, 1828. With Notes and Appendix.

By RICHARD HASTINGS GRAVES, D.D.

London : Published by Rivingtons ; Hamilton, Adams & Co. ; and, in Dublin, by Watsons and Milliken.

Also, lately published in One Volume, 8vo. price 12s. boards,

**CALVINISTIC PREDESTINATION REPUGNANT** to the GENERAL TENOR of SCRIPTURE ; shown in a Series of Discourses on the Moral Attributes and Government of God ; delivered in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin. By the late very Rev. RICHARD GRAVES, D.D. M.R.I.A. ; King's Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin ; Dean of Ardagh, &c.

Just published, in One Volume, 8vo. price 14s. boards.

**A FIFTH EDITION** of a MEMOIR of the late Rev. LEGH RICHMOND, M.A. Rector of Turvey, Bedfordshire, and Author of "THE DAIRYMAN'S DAUGHTER."

By the Rev. T. S. GRIMSHAW, M.A.

Rector of Burton Latimers, and Vicar of Biddenham, Bedfordshire.

Printed for R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, and sold by L. B. Seeley and Sons, Fleet Street.

This day is published, in 12mo. price 1s.

**A MANUAL** of PRAYERS and FAMILY DEVOTIONS for the RELIGIOUS COTTAGER.

By the Author of the "ESSAY ON THE HAPPINESS OF THE LIFE TO COME."

Printed for C. J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall ; and sold by W. Curson, Exeter.

Just published, 8vo., price 10s. 6d. in boards,

**JUSTIFICATION** : being a Dissertation on that Momentous Subject, wherein the leading Principles and Doctrines relative to Salvation, Faith, and Good Works, are also fully discussed, and treated of in a manner entirely new, intended from Scriptural Authority to correct some popular Errors on these subjects : and among other most important points, the following are fully considered :—

The time when Justification does, or is to take place ; whether Good Works are necessarily produced from Faith ; whether Justification is by Faith alone ; and whether Good Works are indispensable in Justification, or are to be received as Evidence only of Faith ; including, also, an Examination of some of the Opinions of the late Rev. Thomas Scott on these subjects.

By JOHN FULLER, Esq.

Printed for C. J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall, London, and sold by Mrs. Binns, J. Upham, and E. Collings, Bath.

Just published, price 21s. boards,

**GREEK SEPTUAGINT**, with the **APOCRYPHA**; from the Oxford Edition of Bos and Holmes. This Edition is handsomely printed in 1 vol. 8vo. hot-pressed; for use in Churches and Chapels as well as the Library.

"This elegantly-executed volume is very correctly printed, and (which cannot but recommend it to students in preference to the incorrect Cambridge and Amsterdam reprints of the Vatican text) its price is so reasonable as to place it within the reach of almost every one."—*Horn's Introduction to the Bible*.

Mr. VALPY has printed this Second Edition in an economical form, to suit the use of the Upper Classes of Schools, into whose hands many tutors are desirous of placing it.

Sold by Longman, Baldwin, Whittaker, Harding, Rivington, J. Richardson, and all other booksellers.

Also, in Three Volumes, 8vo. 2l. 5s. boards,

**GREEK TESTAMENT**, with English Notes: Second Edition. Containing copious Critical, Philological, and Explanatory Notes; with parallel passages, &c. from the Classics, and with references to VIGERUS for Idioms, and BOS for Ellipses. To which is prefixed, a short Treatise on the DOCTRINES of the GREEK ARTICLE, according to BISHOP MIDDLETON, Mr. GRANVILLE SHARPE, &c., briefly and compendiously explained, as applicable to the criticism of the New Testament. The various Readings are recorded under the Text. Greek and English Indexes are added. Two Plates are added, one illustrative of the "Travels of the Apostles," and the other a "Map of Judæa, and a Plan of the City and Temple of Jerusalem."

By the Rev. E. VALPY, B.D.

This work is intended for the use of Students in Divinity as well as for the Library.

"After a minute examination, the author of the present manual considers this edition of the Greek Testament as the most valuable of any that has yet been published, with critical and philological apparatus; especially for students who wish to purchase only one edition of the Greek Testament."—*Horne's Introduction to the Bible*.

\*.\* The SEPTUAGINT and TESTAMENT may be had uniformly bound in four handsome volumes.

## HOMERI ILIAS, CUM NOTIS ANGLICIS.

This day is published, in Two Volumes, 8vo. price 1l. 4s. in bds.

**THE ILIAD** of HOMER, chiefly from the Text of Heyne, with Copious ENGLISH NOTES illustrating the Grammatical Construction, the Manners and Customs, the Mythology and Antiquities of the Heroic Ages; and Preliminary Observations on Points of Classical Interest and Importance connected with Homer and his Writings.

By the Rev. WILLIAM TROLLOPE, M.A.

Late of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and one of the Masters of Christ's Hospital.

Printed for C. J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall.

Of whom may be had, lately published,

**PENTALOGIA GRÆCA.** Sophoclis *Œdipus Tyrannus*; *Œdipus Coloneus*, et *Antigone*; Euripidis *Phœnissæ*; et *Æschyli Septem contra Thebas*. Quinque scilicet Dramata de celeberrima Thebaide Scripta. Notis Anglice Scriptis illustravit, et Lexicon vocum difficiliorum adjecit, GULIELMUS TROLLOPE, M.A. In 8vo. price 14s. boards.

## NEW WORKS

PRINTED FOR

LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND GREEN.

**THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, or CRITICAL JOURNAL.**

No. 98. Price 6s.

CONTENTS :—Westminster Review, No. 21, Art. 16; Bentham's Defence of Mill, Utilitarian System of Philosophy.—Ireland; its Evils and their Remedies. By Michael Thomas Sadler, Esq. M.P.—The Drama; Ebers' Seven Years of the King's Theatre.—Malt and Beer Duties; Licensing System.—Military Education; James's Military Dictionary, the Military Library, Napier's History of the Peninsular War.—Gothic Architecture; Britton's Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain.—Signs of the Times; Anticipation, or an Hundred Years hence; the Rise, Progress, and Present State of Public Opinion in Great Britain; Irving's Last Days.—Cunningham's Lives of the most eminent British Painters, &c.; Mr. Martin.—United States of America; Notions of the Americans, by a Travelling Bachelor; Basil Hall's Travels in North America, &c. &c.

\* \* No. 99 will be published in October.

2. MEMOIRS of the ADMINISTRATION of the Right Hon. HENRY PELHAM, collected from the Family Papers, and other Authentic Documents, and illustrated with Original Correspondence, never before published. By the Rev. W. COXE, M.A. F.R.S. F.S.A. Archdeacon of Wilts. In 2 vols. 4to. with Portraits, from Original Paintings in the possession of his Grace the Duke of Newcastle, price 5*l.* 5*s.*

A few Copies are printed on large paper, uniform with the Author's preceding Works, price 10*l.* 10*s.* bds.

3. CHARGE delivered to the CLERGY of the ARCHDEACONRY of DERBY, at the VISITATIONS at DERBY and CHESTERFIELD. June 18 and 19—1829; and published at their request. By the Rev. S. BUTLER, D.D. F.R.S. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School. In 4to. price 2*s.*

4. An ENCYCLOPÆDIA of PLANTS; comprising every desirable particular respecting all the Plants indigenous, cultivated in or introduced to Britain. Edited by J. C. LOUDON, F.L.S. H.S. &c. The Specific Characters, &c. by JOHN LINDLEY, F.R.S. L.S. and G.S. &c. The Drawings by J. D. C. SOWERBY, F.L.S.; and the Engravings by R. BRANSTON. Complete in one large vol. 8vo. with nearly ten thousand engravings on wood, price 4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.* Part I. II. and III. to be continued every two months, 10*s.* 6*d.* each. Number I. to V. to be continued monthly, 2*s.* 6*d.* each.

5. The HISTORY of THUCYDIDES, newly translated into English, and illustrated with very copious Annotations, Exegetical, Philological, Historical, and Geographical; generally original, but partly selected, translated, and arranged, from the best Commentators, Historians, &c. Prefixed is an entirely new Life of Thucydides; with a Memoir on the State of Greece, Civil and Military, at the commencement of the Peloponnesian War. By the Rev. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, D.D. F.S.A. of Sidney College, Cambridge; Vicar of Bisbrooke, in Rutland, &c. In 3 vols. 8vo. with Maps, price 2*l.* 5*s.*

6. The REIGNS of EDWARD VI., MARY, and ELIZABETH; being the Second Part of the Modern History of England. By SHARON TURNER, F.A.S. R.A. S.L. The second edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 12*s.* boards.

7. A NEW SYSTEM of GEOLOGY, in which the great Revolutions of the Earth and Animated Nature are reconciled at once to Modern Science and to Sacred History. By ANDREW URE, M.D. F.R.S. &c. &c. In 1 vol. 8vo. with 7 plates and 51 Wood-cuts, price 1*l.* 1*s.* boards.

8. The BOOK of NATURE; being a Popular Illustration of the general Laws and Phenomena of Creation, in its Unorganized and Organized, its Corporeal and Mental Departments. By JOHN MASON GOOD, M.D. F.R.S. F.R.S.L. Second edition, 3 vols. 8vo. price 1*l.* 16*s.*

"The work is certainly the best philosophical digest of the kind which we have seen."—*Monthly Review*.

9. SERMONS. By RALPH WARDLAW, D.D. Glasgow. In 8vo. price 12*s.* boards.

By the same Author,

10. DISCOURSES on the principal parts of the SOCINIAN CONTROVERSY. 8vo. 15*s.* boards, 4th edition, much enlarged.

11. The PRINCIPLES of CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY; containing the Doctrines, Duties, Admonitions, and Consolations of the Christian Religion. By JOHN BURNS, M.D., Regius Professor of Surgery in the University of Glasgow, &c. In 12mo. price 7*s.* boards, 3d edition.

12. The ARCHITECTURAL ANTIQUITIES of GREAT BRITAIN. By JOHN BRITTON, F.A.S. &c. In 4to. Part XII. price 2*l.* 8*s.*

This Part contains 34 Engravings, and forms the second part of the fifth volume, or *Chronological Series*.

By the same Author.

13. PICTURESQUE ANTIQUITIES of the ENGLISH CITIES; Nos. I. II. and III. Price each, 1*l.* 4*s.* medium 4to., and 2*l.* Imperial 4to.

14. The HISTORIES, &c. of the Following CATHEDRALS, or either of them separately:—Gloucester, Peterborough, Salisbury, Norwich, Winchester, York, Canterbury, Lichfield, Oxford, Exeter, and Wells: also Accounts of Bath Abbey Church, Redcliffe Church; the Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain. 5 vols. 4to. And other Works by the same Author.

15. The MAGAZINE of NATURAL HISTORY, and JOURNAL of ZOOLOGY, BOTANY, MINERALOGY, and METEOROLOGY. Conducted by J. C. LOUDON, F.L.S. G.S. &c. No. IX. (to be continued every Two Months, alternately with the GARDENER'S MAGAZINE,) 3*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. I. containing the first Five Nos. may be had, 18*s.* bds.

16. The GARDENER'S MAGAZINE, and Register of Rural and Domestic Improvement. Conducted by J. C. LOUDON, F.L.S. H.S. &c. In 8vo. No. XXII. price 3*s.* 6*d.*

Also may be had, Vols. I. to IV., price 2*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* bds.

17. A NEW GENERAL ATLAS, with the Divisions and Boundaries carefully coloured: constructed entirely from New Drawings, and Engraved by SIDNEY HALL. Part I. to XV., printed on Elephant Paper, price 10*s.* 6*d.* each. To be completed in Seventeen Parts.

In order to render this Atlas as perfect as possible, the Proprietors have made arrangements to give *Four Maps* in Place of Three, in Parts XVI. and XVII. without extra charge.

Part XVI. will be published Oct. 10, and contains—The World on Mercator's Projection—British Isles—South America—Western Africa.

Part XVII., Dec. 1, and will contain, in addition to the *Four Maps*, an engraved Title and Index, which will complete the Work.

W O R K S  
IN DIVINITY AND RELATING TO THE CLERGY,  
PUBLISHED BY C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON.

**T**HE OLD and NEW TESTAMENT, arranged in Historical and Chronological Order, in such manner that the Books, Chapters, &c. &c. may be read as one connected History, in the very words of the authorised Translation. With copious Notes and Indexes. By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, M.A. Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Northallerton. In 4 large vols. 8vo. Price 4*l.* boards.

\* \* The Old and New Testament may be had separately.

2. LECTURES on the CRITICISM and INTERPRETATION of the BIBLE, with Two Preliminary Lectures on Theological Study and Theological Arrangement: to which are now added, Two Lectures on the History of Biblical Interpretation. By HERBERT MARSH, D.D. F.R.S. and F.S.A., Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and Bishop of Peterborough. 8vo. 1*l.*s.

The Two additional Lectures may be had separately, to complete the former Edition. Price 2*s.* 6*d.*

3. The ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY of the SECOND and THIRD CENTURIES. Illustrated from the writings of TERTULLIAN. By JOHN, BISHOP of LINCOLN, Master of Christ's College, Cambridge. The Second Edition. 8vo. 13*s.*

4. Some ACCOUNT of the WRITINGS and OPINIONS of JUSTIN MARTYR. By the same Author. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

5. INSTRUCTIONS in READING the LITURGY of the UNITED CHURCH of ENGLAND and IRELAND; offered to the attention of the Younger Clergy, and Candidates for Holy Orders: with an Appendix on Pronunciation, and a Selection of Scripture Proper Names, most liable to be variously pronounced. By the Rev. JOHN HENRY HOWLETT, M.A., Reading Chaplain of His Majesty's Chapel Royal, Whitehall; Vicar of Hollington, Sussex; and formerly Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. Dedicated (by Permission) to the LORD ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY. 8vo. 9*s.*

6. A FOURTH EDITION, with Additions, of Mr. HODGSON'S INSTRUCTIONS for the USE of CANDIDATES for HOLY ORDERS, and of the Parochial Clergy, as to *Ordination*, *Licences*, &c. with the Acts of Parliament relating to the Clergy. 8vo. 8*s.*

7. A TREATISE on the CHURCH, chiefly with respect to its Government; in which the Divine Right of Episcopacy is maintained, the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome proved to be contrary to the Scriptures and primitive Fathers; and the Reformed Episcopal Church in England, Ireland, and Scotland, proved to be a sound and orthodox Part of the Catholic Church. Compiled from the most Eminent Divines. By EDWARD BARWICK, M.A. of Trinity College, Dublin. 8vo. 12*s.*

8. A CRITICAL and PRACTICAL ELUCIDATION of the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland. By the Late JOHN SHEPHERD, M.A., Minister of Pattiswick, Essex. Fifth Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 18*s.*

(RIVINGTON'S WORKS—*continued.*)

9. The DOCTRINE of the GREEK ARTICLE applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the NEW TESTAMENT. By the Right Rev. T. F. MIDDLETON, late Lord Bishop of Calcutta. Second Edition, revised by the Rev. JAMES SCHOLEFIELD, A.M., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 16s.

10. A CONNECTION of SACRED and PROFANE HISTORY, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, (intended to complete the Works of SHUCKFORD and PRIDEAUX). By the Rev. MICHAEL RUSSELL, LL.D., Episcopal Minister at Leith. In Two closely printed Volumes. Price 1*l.* 8s. in boards.

11. TESTIMONIES in PROOF of the SEPARATE EXISTENCE of the SOUL in a State of Self-consciousness between Death and the Resurrection. To which is added, the Psychopannychia of Calvin. By the Rev. THOMAS HUNTINGFORD, M.A., Vicar of Kemsford, Gloucestershire. In one Volume, Post 8vo. 10s. 6*d.*

12. A COMPENDIOUS VIEW of the EVIDENCES of NATURAL and REVEALED RELIGION; being the Substance of Lectures read in the University of King's College, Aberdeen. By ALEXANDER and GILBERT GERARD, D.D., late Professors of Divinity, and Chaplains in Ordinary for Scotland to his late Majesty. 8vo. 8s. 6*d.*

13. The PSALTER, or PSALMS of DAVID; according to the Version and Arrangement of the Book of Common Prayer; illustrated, explained, and adapted to general use, in Public and Private Worship: with preliminary Dissertations and accompanying Notes: intended as a Key to the Psalms, and a Companion to the Prayer Book. By the Rev. RICHARD WARNER, F.A.S., Hon. Member of the Society of Natural History, Moscow; of the Dutch Society of Sciences, Haarlaem; and Rector of Great Chatfield, Wilts. 8vo. 10s. 6*d.*

14. PROPHECIES of CHRIST and CHRISTIAN TIMES; selected from the Old and New Testament, and arranged according to the Periods in which they were pronounced. By a LAYMAN. Edited by the Rev. HENRY CLISOLD, M.A., Minister of Stockwell Chapel, Lambeth. 8vo.

15. The CHRISTIAN SABBATH; or an Enquiry into the Religious Obligation of keeping holy One Day in Seven. By the Rev. GEO. HOLDEN, A.M., Author of a Dissertation on the Fall of Man, &c. &c. In one Volume, 8vo. Price 12s. in boards.

16. A KEY to the REVELATION of St. JOHN; being an Analysis of those Parts of that Prophetic Book which relate to the General State of the Christian Church in After-Times; and to the Peculiar Signs of those Times. By the Rev. PHILIP ALLWOOD, B.D., Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge. In two Volumes, 8vo. 1*l.* 4s.

17. An ADDRESS delivered to the CANDIDATES for HOLY ORDERS, in the Diocese of BARBADOS and the LEEWARD ISLANDS. By the Right Rev. WILLIAM HART COLERIDGE, D.D., Bishop of Barbadoes. 12mo. 3s.

18. A SECOND ENQUIRY into the GROUNDS on which the PROPHETIC PERIOD of DANIEL and ST. JOHN has been supposed to consist of 1260 Years, containing an Examination of the Arguments of MEDE, Remarks on a Passage in the Dialogues on Prophecy, on various Reviews of the First Enquiry, and on the common Interpretation of the Seven Heads of the Beast. By S. R. MAITLAND. 8vo. 6s.



(RIVINGTON'S WORKS—*continued.*)

22. **ANNOTATIONS ECCLESIASTICAL and DEVOTIONAL**, intended to illustrate the **LITURGY** and the **THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES** of the **UNITED CHURCH of ENGLAND and IRELAND**; with an Historical Introduction. By **THOMAS HARWOOD, D.D. F.S.A.** Small 8vo. 6s. 6d.

23. **The PRIMER**; a **BOOK of PRIVATE PRAYER**, needful to all Christians; which was authorized and set forth by order of King Edward the Sixth, to be Taught, Learned, Read, and Used, by all his Subjects. Edited by the Rev. **H. WALTER, B.D. F.R.S.** Late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Second Edition. 12mo. 3s.

24. **The MOHAMMEDAN SYSTEM of THEOLOGY**; or a Compendious Survey of the History and Doctrines of Islamism, contrasted with Christianity; together with remarks on the Prophecies relative to its Dissolution. By the Rev. **W. H. NEALE, A.M.** Chaplain of the County Bridewell, Gosport, Hants. 8vo. 10s.

25. **An ANALYSIS of the TEXT of the HISTORY of JOSEPH**, upon the Principles of Professor Lee's Hebrew Grammar. For the use of Students in St. David's College, Lampeter. By the Rev. **ALFRED OLLIVANT, M.A.** Vice-Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

26. **The SCHOLAR'S INSTRUCTOR**, a **HEBREW GRAMMAR**, with Points. By **ISRAEL LYONS**, formerly Teacher of the Hebrew Language in the University of Cambridge. Revised and corrected by **HENRY JACOB**. The Fourth Edition. 8vo. 5s.

---

**DR. LARDNER'S CABINET CYCLOPÆDIA.** To be published in Monthly Volumes, price 6s. commencing in November.

The following Volumes, among others, are in preparation, and will appear at an early period in the progress of the work.

**HISTORY of SCOTLAND**—2 Vols. By Sir Walter Scott. (The first Volume will appear in November.

**THE HISTORY of MARITIME DISCOVERY**—2 Vols.

**THE LIVES of BRITISH POLITICAL CHARACTERS**—3 Vols.

**A TREATISE ON ASTRONOMY**—1 Vol. By J. F. W. Herschel, Esq. F.R.S. L. & E. &c. &c. (It is intended that the scientific treatises shall be written in a popular and generally intelligible style, entirely free from mathematical symbols, and disencumbered as far as possible of technical phrases. That they will not, however, be superficial or unsound, the publishers trust is guaranteed by the names of the eminent persons who have undertaken to write them.)

**HISTORY of ENGLAND**—3 Vols. By the Right Hon. Sir James Mackintosh.

**THE USEFUL ARTS**—Baking, Brewing, Distilling, Wine-making, &c.—1 Vol.

**HISTORY of IRELAND**—1 Vol. By Thomas Moore, Esq.

**A TREATISE ON LIGHT**—1 Vol. By David Brewster, LL.D. F.R.S. &c.

**HISTORY of GREECE**—2 Vols. By the Rev. Connop Thirlwall, F.T.C.C.

**LIVES of EMINENT BRITISH LAWYERS**—1 Vol. By Henry Roscoe, Esq.

**A TREATISE ON MECHANICS**—1 Vol. By Dr. Lardner, &c. &c.

The publication of the work will commence in November, with the First Volume of the **HISTORY of SCOTLAND**, in Two Volumes, by Sir **WALTER SCOTT**.

A Prospectus, explanatory of the plan and design of the work, may be had at all the Booksellers.

Printed for Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, Paternoster-Row; and John Taylor, Gower-Street.



OCTOBER, 1829.

## WORKS

VERY LATELY PUBLISHED,

BY

C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

---

### I.

HENRY and ANTONIO;

or, the Proselytes of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches.

Translated from the Third Edition of the German of

Dr. C. G. BRETSCHNEIDER,

Chief Counsellor of the Consistory and General Superintendant in Gotha.

By the Rev. M. MORGAN,

Chaplain to the British Residents at Gothenburg.

12mo. 6s. 6d.

### II.

The STATE of PROTESTANTISM in GERMANY DESCRIBED;

being the Substance of Four Discourses preached before the University of  
Cambridge, in 1825. Second Edition, considerably enlarged.

With an Appendix. 8vo. 14s.

By the Rev. HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.

Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, and Vicar of Horsham, Sussex.

### III.

LECTURES on the ELEMENTS of HIEROGLYPHICS  
and EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES.

By the MARQUIS SPINETO.

With PLATES. 8vo. 16s.

### IV.

The LIFE of the Right Rev. THOMAS WILSON, D.D.

Late Lord Bishop of SODOR and MAN. Third Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Portrait.

By the Reverend HUGH STOWELL,

Rector of Ballaugh, Isle of Man.

## V.

## APOLOGIE ou DEFENSE de la BIBLE;

Par RICHARD WATSON, D.D.

Eveque de Llandaff.

Traduit de l'Anglais, et suivi d'un Résumé de Preuves en Faveur du Christianisme,  
et d'un Appendice.

Par L. T. VENTOUILLAC.

12mo.

## VI.

The REVELATION and INCARNATION of MITHRA;  
or a SKETCH of the SACRED HISTORY of the CENTRAL WORLD.

By a LAYMAN.

Small 8vo. 5s.

## VII.

## DEVOTIONS for YOUTH.

12mo. 2s.

## VIII.

## SERMONS on various SUBJECTS and OCCASIONS:

including Three Discourses on the Evidences, the Obligations, and the Spirit of  
the Gospel.

By the Rev. JAMES WALKER, D.D.

Of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Episcopal Professor of Theology at  
Edinburgh.

8vo. 10s. 6d.

## IX.

## PAROCHIAL LETTERS,

from a BENEFICED CLERGYMAN to his CURATE. Small 8vo. 8s. 6d.

CONTENTS.—Introductory—Parsonage—Gardening—Visiting—Churches—Psalmody—  
Instruction of the Poor—Province of Private Christians—Preaching—Catholics—  
Cant—Universality of the Church—The Poor—Friendly Societies and  
Savings Banks—The Clergy.

## X.

An INQUIRY into the HERESIES of the APOSTOLIC AGE,  
in EIGHT SERMONS, preached before the University of OXFORD, in the Year 1829,  
at the LECTURE founded by the Rev. JOHN BAMPTON, M.A. Canon of Salisbury.

By the Rev. EDWARD BURTON, D.D.

Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

8vo. 15s.

## XI.

## The GERMAN PULPIT;

being a Collection of Sermons by the most eminent modern Divines of Germany.

Selected and Translated by the Rev. R. BAKER,

Chaplain to the British Factory at Hamburgh.

8vo. 10s. 6d.

## XII.

## NEW CRITICISMS on the CELEBRATED TEXT, 1 JOHN, v. 7.

in a Synodical Lecture, by F. A. KNITTEL, Counsellor to the Consistory, and General Superintendant of the Grand Duchy of BRUNSWICK LUNEBURG.

Published at Brunswick in 1785, and Translated from the German

by W. A. EVANSON, M.A. Lecturer of St. Luke's, Old Street.

8vo. 7s. 6d.

## XIII.

## EXTRACTS from and OBSERVATIONS

on CICERO'S DIALOGUES de SENECTUTE et de AMICITIA,  
and a Translation of his SOMNIUM SCIPIONIS. With Notes.

By W. DANBY, Esq.

Of Swinton Park, Yorkshire.

8vo. 5s.

## XIV.

## ÆSCHYLI AGAMEMNON TRIGLOTTUS:

GRÆCE: Textum ad Fidem, Editionum, præsertim Blomfieldianæ, recognovit,  
Notasque Anglice conscriptas et Indices adjeicit JACOBUS KENNEDY, S.T.P.

Collegii SS. Trinitatis apud Dublinienses Socius.

TEUTSCH: Uebersetzt von HEINRICH VOSS.

ENGLISH: Translated by JAMES KENNEDY, D.D.

Royal 8vo. 12s.

## XV.

## SERMONS on the DOMESTIC DUTIES.

To which are added, Two SERMONS upon CONFIRMATION. 12mo. 5s.

By the Rev. DANIEL CRESSWELL, D.D.

Vicar of Enfield, Middlesex.

*The Two Sermons upon Confirmation may be had separately, price 8d.*

## XVI.

A SYNOPSIS of the PRINCIPAL FORMULÆ and RESULTS  
of PURE MATHEMATICS. 8vo. 15s.

By CHARLES BROOKE, M.B.

Of St. John's College, Cambridge.

## WORKS LATELY PUBLISHED,

## XVII.

## FIVE PAROCHIAL SERMONS,

adapted to the PRESENT CRISIS. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

By J. HUSBAND, A.M.

Curate of Neston, and late Bye-Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge.

## XVIII.

## A MANUAL of FAMILY DEVOTION,

containing a Form of Prayer for every Morning and Evening in the Week;  
selected and compiled chiefly from the Book of Common Prayer.

Fourth Edition. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

By the Rev. THOMAS STEVENSON, M.A.

Chaplain to the Most Noble the Marquis Wellesley.

## XIX.

## On CHRISTIAN SINCERITY.

By JOHN PENROSE, M.A.

Formerly of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

Small 8vo. 5s.

## XX.

## TESTIMONIES

in Proof of the separate Existence of the Soul in a state of Self-consciousness  
between Death and the Resurrection. To which is added, the  
Psychopannychia of Calvin.

By the Rev. THOMAS HUNTINGFORD, M.A.

Vicar of Kempsford, Gloucestershire.

In 1 vol. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

## XXI.

## A KEY to the REVELATION of ST. JOHN ;

being an Analysis of those Parts of that Prophetical Book which relate to the  
General State of the Christian Church in After-Times ; and to the  
Peculiar Signs of those Times.

By the Reverend PHILIP ALLWOOD, B.D.

Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge.

In 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

## XXII.

An ADDRESS delivered to the CANDIDATES for HOLY ORDERS,  
in the Diocese of BARBADOS and the LEEWARD ISLANDS.

By the Right Rev. WILLIAM HART COLERIDGE, D.D.

Bishop of Barbados.

12mo. 3s.

## THE FOLLOWING WORKS

*ARE IN THE PRESS.*

---

### I.

The LIFE of RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D.

Master of Trinity College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

By the Very Reverend JAMES HENRY MONK, D.D.  
Dean of Peterborough.

In one Volume, 4to. With a Portrait.

### II.

SERMONS.

By the Author of the "LIVING and the DEAD."  
In one Volume. 8vo.

### III.

An APPENDIX to the HISTORICAL INQUIRY into the  
Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology  
of Germany, in Explanation of the Views misconceived by Mr. ROSE.

By E. B. PUSEY, M.A.  
Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Hebrew in the  
University of Oxford.

### IV.

TRACTATUS VARII INTEGRI,  
operibus PATRUM GRÆCORUM et LATINORUM excerpti.

A THOMA TURTON,  
Sanctæ Theologiæ apud Cantabrigienses Professore Regio.

In one large Vol. 8vo.

In forming this Work, it is the Editor's intention to publish, for the use of Students in  
Divinity, a Selection of the most valuable Productions of the Fathers  
who flourished during the first Four Centuries.

## V.

## A NEW EDITION of a GUIDE to the CHURCH.

By the Rev. CHARLES DAUBENY, LL.D.

Late Archdeacon of Sarum.

In 2 vols. 8vo.

## VI.

## CHRISTIANITY a PROGRESSIVE SCHEME;

in Answer to the Objections offered to its want of Universality. Being the  
Christian Advocate's Publication for the year 1829. 8vo.

By HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.

Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, and Vicar of Horsham,  
Sussex.

## VII.

## The LIFE of ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

By the Rev. HENRY JOHN TODD, M.A.

Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty, and Rector of Settrington, Yorkshire.

In one Volume, 8vo. With a Portrait.

## VIII.

## The SCHEME and COMPLETION of PROPHECY,

wherein its Design and Use, together with its Sense and Application, as a  
Fundamental Proof of Religion, are considered and explained. Together  
with a Dissertation on the Shechinah and the Cherubim in the  
Holy of Holies. 8vo.

By the Rev. JOHN WHITLEY, D.D. &amp; LL.D.

Master of the School of Galway.

## IX.

## THE FIFTH EDITION OF

## SERMONS on SEVERAL SUBJECTS and OCCASIONS.

By the late Rev. JAMES RIDDOCH, A.M.

Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, Aberdeen.

In 2 vols. 8vo.

## X.

## A Practical GUIDE to the READING of the NEW TESTAMENT.

Intended for the use of General Readers.

By the Rev. GEORGE HOLDEN, M.A.

In one large Volume, 12mo.

XI.

S E R M O N S.

Now First published from the Original Manuscripts.

By the late Rev. WILLIAM JONES,  
of Nayland.

In 2 vols. 8vo.

XII.

The PSALTER of DAVID :

With TITLES and COLLECTS, according to the matter of each Psalm;  
and Devotions for General Use. New Edition, 12mo.

By the Right Rev. JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.  
Late Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore.

XIII.

THE SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND CORRECTED, OF  
A NEW ANALYSIS of CHRONOLOGY,

Sacred and Profane. In 4 vols. 8vo.

By the Rev. Dr. HALES.

XIV.

PASTORALIA ;

or a MANUAL of HELPS to the PAROCHIAL CLERGYMAN :  
containing a Scriptural View of the Clerical Duties—Hints for Pastoral Visits—  
Prayers for the Use of the Clergy—and Skeletons of Sermons.

By the Rev. HENRY THOMPSON, M.A.  
Of St. John's College, Cambridge, Curate of Wrington, Somerset.

In one large Volume, 12mo.

XV.

P O E M S.

By Mrs. CHARLES NEALDS.

In 12mo.

XVI.

A NEW EDITION OF

MILLER'S GARDENERS' and BOTANISTS' DICTIONARY ;

containing a complete Enumeration and Description of all Plants hitherto known,  
newly arranged according to the System of Jussieu, and comprising all  
the modern Improvements and Discoveries which have been made  
in the Sciences of Botany, Horticulture, and Agriculture,  
to the present Time. With numerous Woodcuts.

To be published in Parts, and completed in Four Volumes, Quarto.

Edited by GEORGE DON, A.L.S.

# SERMONS

PUBLISHED DURING THE PRESENT YEAR,

By C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

*St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall.*

---

**BURTON.**—An **INQUIRY** into the **HERESIES** of the **APOSTOLIC AGE**, in eight Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford, in the Year 1829, at the Lecture founded by the Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury. By the Rev. **EDWARD BURTON**, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church. In one large vol. 8vo. 15s.

**THE GERMAN PULPIT**;—being a Collection of Sermons by the most eminent modern Divines of Germany. Selected and Translated by the Rev. **R. BAKER**, Chaplain to the British Factory at Hamburgh. In one vol. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**ARNOLD.**—**SERMONS.** By the Rev. **THOMAS ARNOLD**, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**WALKER.**—**SERMONS** on **VARIOUS SUBJECTS** and **OCCASIONS.** By the Rev. **JAMES WALKER**, D.D., of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Episcopal Professor of Theology at Edinburgh. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**WIX.**—**PRACTICAL SERMONS** on the **LORD'S PRAYER** and the **BEATITUDES**, adapted to Family Reading. With two Sermons on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. By **SAMUEL WIX**, A.M. F.R.S. and A.S. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

**HUSBAND.**—**FIVE PAROCHIAL SERMONS**, adapted to the Present Crisis. By **J. HUSBAND**, A.M., Curate of Norton, and late Bye-Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

**FRASER.**—**SERMONS** on the **LIVES** of some of the First **PROMULGATORS** of **CHRISTIANITY**, and on **MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS**, preached in the Parish of Bromley, Middlesex. By the Rev. **PETER FRASEP**, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Chaplain to his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge. 8vo. 8s.

**CRESSWELL.**—**SERMONS** on **DOMESTIC DUTIES.** By the Rev. **DANIEL CRESSWELL**, D.D., Vicar of Enfield, Middlesex. 12mo. 5s.

**HAGGITT.**—**SERMONS.** By the Rev. **JOHN HAGGITT**, Rector of Ditton, near Cambridge. 8vo. 8s.

**WILLIS.**—**SERMONS** for **SERVANTS.** By the Rev. **W. DOWNES WILLIS**, M.A., Vicar of Kirkby in Cleveland. 12mo. 6s.

**LAUD.**—**SERMONS**, Preached by **WILLIAM LAUD**, D.D. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and Chancellor of the University of Oxford. Reprinted verbatim from the last Edition in 1651, and edited by the Rev. **J. W. HATHERELL**, M.A., of Brasenose College, Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**SHUTTLEWORTH.**—**SERMONS** on some of the leading **PRINCIPLES** of **CHRISTIANITY.** By **PHILIP NICHOLAS SHUTTLEWORTH**, D.D. Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley, Wilts. 2d edit. 8vo. 12s.



# CONTENTS

OF

Nº. XII.

---

PAGE

- ART. I. 1. Letters on the Church. By an Episcopalian.
2. An Inquiry concerning the Means and Expedience of proposing and making any Change in the Canons, Articles, or Liturgy, or in any of the Laws affecting the Interests of the Church of England. By William Winstanley Hull.
3. Church Reform. By a Churchman. . . . . 267
- II. Memoirs of the Administration of the Right Honourable Henry Pelham, collected from the Family Papers, and other authentic Documents. By William Coxe, M.A. F.R.S. F.S.A. Archdeacon of Wilts. . . . . 313
- III. *Prolegomena specialia, recognovit Dathianisque et Variorum Notis suas immiscuit Franciscus Wrangham, A.M. S.R.S. Clevelandiæ Archidiaconus.* . . . . . 346
- IV. The History and Antiquities of the Town and Minster of Beverley, in the County of York, from the most early period; with historical and descriptive Sketches of the Abbeys of Watton and Meaux, the Convent of Haltemprise, the Villages of Cottingham, Leckonfield, Bishop and Cherry Burton, Walkington, Risby, Scarborough, and the Hamlets comprised within the Liberties of Beverley; illustrated by numerous Engravings, &c.

ART.	PAGE
By George Oliver, Vicar of Clee, Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honourable Lord Kensington; a Corresponding Member of the Society of Antiquaries, Scotland. . . . .	362
V. Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe, Wife of the Right Hon. Sir Richard Fanshawe, Bart. Ambassador from Charles the Second to the Court of Madrid in 1665. Written by Herself. To which are added, Extracts from the Correspondence of Sir Richard Fanshawe. . . . .	369
VI. A New System of Geology, in which the Great Revolutions of the Earth and Animated Nature are reconciled at once to Modern Science and Sacred History. By Andrew Ure, M.D. F.A.S. Member of the Geological and Astronomical Societies of London, &c. &c. &c., Professor of Physics and Lecturer on Chemistry in the Andersonian University. . . . .	387
VII. The Life and Times of William Laud, D.D. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. By John Parker Lawson, M.A.	412
VIII. 1. An Historical Enquiry into the probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany. To which is prefixed, a Letter from Professor Sack, upon the Rev. H. J. Rose's Discourses on German Protestantism; translated from the German. By E. B. Pusey, M.A. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.	
2. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of London, in reply to Mr. Pusey's Work on the Causes of Rationalism in Germany; comprising some Observations on Confessions of Faith, and their Advantages. By the Rev. Hugh James Rose, B.D. Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, and Vicar of Horsham, Sussex. . . . .	469

## ART.

## PAGE

- IX. A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Thursday, May 14, 1829, at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy. By the Rev. Charles Webb Le Bas, M.A. Rector of St. Paul's, Shadwell; Professor in the East India College, Hertford; and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. . . . . 485
- X. The Complete Emancipation of the Protestant Vaudois of Piedmont Advocated in a strong and unanswerable Argument, and submitted to His Grace the Duke of Wellington, by their Countryman, Count Ferdinand Dal Pozzo, late Maître des Requêtes, and First President of the Imperial Court of Genoa. . . . . 490
- XI. Sermons, chiefly Practical. By the Rev. Edward Bather, M.A. Archdeacon of Salop, in the Diocese of Lichfield and Coventry; and Vicar of Meole Brace, Salop. 492

---

State of the Dioceses in England and Wales . . . . .	500
Proceedings of the Universities . . . . .	511



THE  
**BRITISH CRITIC,**  
QUARTERLY  
**THEOLOGICAL REVIEW,**  
AND  
**Ecclesiastical Record.**

VOLUME XII.

LONDON :  
PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,  
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL ;  
AND  
SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH ; AND  
MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1832.

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH AND SONS, BELL-YARD,  
TEMPLE-BAR.

## INDEX OF BOOKS REVIEWED.

\* \* For Remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Ecclesiastical and other Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

### B.

*Babbage* (Charles), on Machinery, 142.  
*Burgess* (Rev. Richard), Topography and Antiquities of Rome, 196.

### C.

*Chalmers* (Thomas, D.D.) on Political Economy, 306.  
——— Statement on the Pauperism of Glasgow, 428.  
*Clerical Education*, a Letter on, 180.  
*Cooper* (C. P.), Account of the Public Records of Great Britain, 101.

### D.

*Deacon*, Letter on the Office of, 180.  
*Dumont* (Etienne), Souvenirs sur Mira-beau, 1.  
*Dusautoy* (Rev. Frederick), Self-delusion, a Sermon, 178.

### F.

*Faber* (Rev. G. S.), the Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, 258.  
VOL. XII.

### H.

*Hall* (Capt. Basil), Fragment of Voyages, 88.  
*Hall* (Rev. George), Fast Day Sermon, 166.  
*Harford* (John S.), The Agamemnon of Æschylus, translated, 371.

### J.

*Johnson* (Rev. Arthur), Christus Crucifixus, 169.

### M.

*Medwin* (J.), the Agamemnon and Prometheus of Æschylus, translated, 371.  
*Meer Hassan Ali* (Mrs.), Observations on the Musselmanns of India, 397.  
*Milton* (John), Poetical Works, by the Rev. John Mitford, 43.  
*Mortimer* (Rev. Thomas), A Word for God, a sermon, 172.  
*Munday* (Captain), Pen and Pencil Sketches in India, 397.  
*Mure* (W.), Dissertation on the Calendar and Zodiac of Ancient Egypt, 120.  
h

*Mure* (W.), Brief Remarks on the Chronology of the Egyptian Dynasties, 120.

## P.

*Prison Discipline*, Report of the Society for the Improvement of, 428.

## S.

*Shuttleworth* (Rev. Dr. P. N.), The Consistency of Revelation with itself, and with Human Reason, 138.

*Sketches* from Venetian History, 416.

*Sophocles*, Choruses of, translated, 371.

*Southey* (Robert), Essays, 428.

## T.

*Turner* (Sharon), Sacred History of the World, 64.

## W.

*Walker* (Thomas), Observations on Pauperism, 428.

*Warton* (John), Death-Bed Scenes, 348.

*Wateley* (Rt. Rev. Dr.), Thoughts on Secondary Punishments, 428.

*Wood* (Rev. William), The Sabbath, a sermon, 174.

*Wood* (William), Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School, 185.



# INDEX

OF THE

## REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

### CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, ECCLESIASTICAL AND UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.



#### A.

*Acesius*, a Novatian Bishop, anecdote of, 272, *note*.

*Æschylus's* tragedies, general observations on, 380—382—particularly on his *Prometheus*, 383, 384—character of Potter's version of his tragedies, 378—specimens of Mr. Medwin's translation of that tragedy, 384—notice of Giacomelli's Italian translation of it, 377—character of Dr. Harford's translation of his *Agamemnon*, 378, 379—and of Mr. Medwin's version, 380—observations on the *Prometheus*, 383—386—specimens of Mr. Medwin's translation of it, 384, 385—comparison between *Æschylus* and *Sophocles*, 386, 387.

*Appian Way*, description of, 222—and of the tomb of the *Scipios* there, 223—225.

*Arch*, triumphal, of *Titus*, observations on, 226—231.

*Arian System*, difficulty in disputing against—*first*, from the belief of the first Christians concerning the nature and dignity of the Son of God, 265, 266—*secondly*, from the flexible nature of this system, 266—268.

*Augustine*, the father of the doctrine now termed Calvinistic, 304—the tenets avowed by him not known to preceding fathers, 305.

the art of printing by mechanism, 144, 145—on a mode of engraving copper-plates by pressure, 146—148—on the advantages of the division of labour in the manufacture of pins, 149, 150—account of his calculating machine, 150—153—on the influence of national character in producing commercial confidence, 153, 154—on the possibility of applying machinery to the conveyance of letters, 154, 155—and on the triumphs of science, 156, 157.

*Begum Sumroo*, biographical anecdotes of, 413, 414.

*Birch's* (Dr.), *Life of Milton*, character of, 43, 44.

*Burgess* (Rev. Richard), advantages enjoyed by, for composing his *Treatise on the Antiquities of Rome*, 201—character and plan of his work, *ib.* 202—his description of Rome and its environs, as seen from the Capitoline Hill, 204—208—his account of the true situation of the capitol of Rome, 213, 214—and of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, 214—216—description of the external appearance of the recently discovered temple of Venus and Rome, 217—220—philological illustration of ancient heathen temples, 220—222—on the prospects of futurity entertained by the Ancients, 224, 225.

#### B.

*Babbage* (Charles, Esq.), observations of, on the addition made by machinery and manufactures to human power, 143—in the economy of time, *ib.* 144—and the conversion of apparently worthless substances into valuable products, 144—his account of the improvements in  
VOL. XII.

#### C.

*Calculating Machine*, account of the principles of, 150—153.

*Calendar* of the Egyptians, observations on, 132—141.

*Cali Yuga*, an astronomical epoch of the Hindoos, notice of, 120, 121.

*Cambridge University*, number of the

- members of, 256—degrees conferred, 251, 252. 493, 494—miscellaneous university intelligence, 253, 254. 494—496—prize offered, 251—previous examinations—Lent Term, 1832, 235, 236.
- Canaanites*, observations on the destruction of, 159—161.
- Capital*, power of, for the maintenance of a people, 315—317—effects of an accumulation of capital, 318, 319.
- Capitol* of Rome, probable site of, 213, 214.
- Carmeli's* translation of Euripides, character of, 376.
- Catechumens*, observations on the instructions anciently given to, 282.
- Chalmers* (Rev. Dr.) character of his writings on political economy, 348—his illustration of the principle that the last or worst description of soil under cultivation is generally unprofitable, though it may in many cases be profitably entered upon, 309—312—that labourers in the present day are better off than their forefathers, 313—considerations on the power of capital for the maintenance of a people, 315—319—on the possibility of over production, 321, 322—cause of his error in ascribing too little to trade and manufactures, 324, 325—exposition of his mistake in concluding that taxes fall entirely upon the land, 325—329—his opinion on the operation of tithes, 331—recommends an alteration in the present tithe system, 332—remarks on his theory of unproductive labour, 334, 335—and of the national debt, 336—his illustration of the nature and value of food, 346, 347—his plan of providing for the poor of Glasgow, 451—its beneficial results, 451—453—remarks thereon, 453, 454.
- Champollions'* calculations of the era of Sesostris, examined and refuted, 124—130—remarks on their discoveries in Egyptian hieroglyphics, 138, 139.
- Channing* (Dr.) strictures on the conduct of, in the Socinian controversy, 299, 300.
- Character*, influence of, in producing commercial confidence, 155, 156.
- Chartres* (Bishop of), character of, 13, 14.
- Christian Knowledge Society*, benefits to be expected from its committee for publishing works of general literature and education, 449, 450.
- Christianity*, effects of, when sincerely received, 163, 164—duties of a Christian teacher, 165—opinion of the first Christians on the nature and dignity of the Son of God, 265.
- Chronology*, ancient, causes of the obscurity of, 120—extravagant claims of the Egyptians and Chaldeans to antiquity, exposed, *ib.* 121—the Sotliacal period, 122—account of the Julian period, 123.
- Church-Establishment*, importance of, 345.
- Clement* of Alexandria, testimony of, to the worship of Christ, 276.
- Clergymen* of the Church of England, lists of, preferred, 232—236. 483—487—ordained, 236—238—married, 490—deceased, 239—242. 488—490—candidates for orders, recommended to serve a sort of apprenticeship to their senior clergy, 180—182.
- Clerical Education*, observations on, 180—184.
- Colonization*, ancient and modern, contrasted, 478—defects of the present system of colonization, 479, 480—scheme for the formation of new colonies, 480—482.
- Constantinople*, siege and capture of, by the French crusaders and the Venetians, 422—423.
- Consubstantial*, observations on the introduction of the term, 269, 270.
- Convicts*, strictures on the transportation of, 469, 470—suggestions for the employment of, 475—477.
- Copper-plates*, the process of engraving of, by pressure, described, 146—148.
- Cotton* (Sir Robert), harsh treatment of, by the privy council, 104—account of his collection of manuscripts, 105.
- Courts, Christian*, design and beneficial influence of, 465, 466.
- Couches*, oriental, notice of, 98.
- Cowper's* translations from Milton's Latin Poems, remarks on, 46, 47.
- Creation* of the world, philosophical view of, 77—83—strictures on Mr. Turner's history of, 64—70.
- Creeds*, origin of, 265—of the Nicene creed, 268—testimonies of the ancient creeds to the Trinitarian doctrine, 278, 279—notice of one of the Arian creeds, 298, *note*.
- Criminals*, observations on the transportation of, 469, 470—on the treatment of juvenile criminals, 470—472—and of criminal lunatics, 473, 474.
- Crusaders* of France, embassy of, to the Doge and Senate of Venice, 419, 420—their voyage to, and capture of Constantinople, described, 420—428.

## D.

*Deacons*, observations on the duties of, 182—184.

*Deaths* of clergymen, lists of, 239—242. 488—490.

*Death-bed Scenes*, in ancient literature, remarks on, 348—Death Song of Ragnar Lodbrog, 349—notice of some death-bed scenes, portrayed by monastic writers, 349—350—abridgement of several from Gregory's dialogues, 351—355—extracts from Dr. Warton's *Death-bed Scenes of Happy Old Age*, 356, 357—of hopes and fears, 357.

*Degrees* conferred at the universities, lists of, at Oxford, 243—246. 491, 492—at Cambridge, 251, 252. 493, 494.

*Dioceses*, state of, 232—242. 483—490.

*Dionysius* of Alexandria, testimony of, to the worship of Christ, 276.

*Doxologies* of the ancient Church, testimonies of, to the doctrine of the Trinity, 280.

*Dumont* (Etienne), biographical anecdotes of, 1, 2—character of his reminiscences of Count Mirabeau, 3—his character of Sieyes, 13—writes an address on the proposal of the French Commons to organize themselves under the title of the deputies of the French people, which is delivered by Mirabeau, 15—his description of the Séance Royale, 16—writes Mirabeau's address to the King, 19—engages with him in conducting the *Journal de Provence*, 20—writes the address from the National Assembly to the French people, 21—remarks on it, *ib.* 22—Mirabeau's valedictory address to him, 33—remarks on his character of Louis XVI., 40, 41.

*Dusautoy* (Rev. F.) observations of, on the effects of selfishness, 178, 179—his definition of prayer, 179, 180—remarks on it, 180.

## E.

*Edinburgh Sessional School*, account of the method of instruction adopted in, 185—195.

*Education* (Christian) importance and necessity of, 344, 345—defective state of the education of the people, 440, 441—neglect of national education at the reformation, 442—efforts of the National Society and of the schools in connexion with it, 443—necessity of enlarging the course of education given

to the poor, 447, 448—its practicability evinced in the Edinburgh Sessional School, 449.

*Egyptians*, extravagant claims of, to antiquity, 120, 121—account of their astronomical Sothiacal period, 122—the era of their great king, Sesostris, according to MM. Champollions, examined and refuted, 124—130—tables of the 24th to the 30th dynasty of their kings, according to Eusebius and other ancient chronologers, 126—observations on the Egyptian calendar and zodiac, 132—137—on MM. Champollions' discoveries in Egyptian hieroglyphics, 138, 139—and on Professor Renwick's attempt to ascertain the earliest date of Egyptian colonization, 139—141.

*Emigration*, in what cases beneficial, 336.

*Euripides*, observations on the tragedies of, 388—389—analysis of his *Medea*, 389—391—comparison between his tragedy of *Electra* and that of Sophocles, 393—a clue to the right understanding of the *Orestes* of Euripides, 392—translation of a scene in which the madness and returning calmness of Orestes are portrayed, 394—397—critical notices of the adaptation from the *Phœnissæ* of Euripides to the English stage by Gascoigne and Kinkelmarsh, 373—375—notice of various Italian translations of his tragedies, 375, 376—of Sibilet's version of his *Iphigénie*, 377.

*Exorcism*, Mussulmaun, described, 410, 411.

*Experimental Philosophy*, remarks on Cowley's scheme for the advancement of, 58.

## F.

*Faber* (Rev. G. S.), character of his "Apostolicity of Trinitarianism," 257, 258—its plan, 262—272—remarks on it, 263—273—on his assumption that the notions of essential divinity and of divine worship are necessarily reciprocal and consolative, 275, 276—abstract of his testimonies from the fathers of the Church to the fact of the Trinitarian Doctrine being held, 276, 277—from the ancient apologies, official epistles, and other public documents of the early Church, 278—from the creeds and symbols of the Church, 279—from the liturgies and doxologies of the Church, 280—from the discipline of

the mysteries, 281, 282—the unanimous primitive interpretation of texts now litigated, 283, 284—his triumphant refutation of Dr. Priestley's misrepresentation of Hegesippus's testimony to the divinity of Christ, 284—287—and of his assertion that the common people among the early Christians believed nothing of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, 288—290—abstract of his evidence to show that the doctrine of the Trinity was not first introduced by Justin Martyr, 290—292—remarks on his endeavours to prove that there is nothing in the writings of Origen, discountenancing the doctrine that plenary adoration is due to Christ, 294, 295—and in his objection to the application of rabbinical figments to the illustration of John vii. 27, 295, 296—concluding remarks on the execution of his work, 305, 306.

*Famine*, in India, integrity of the Hindoos during, 99.

*Fast* (Mahomedan), rigour of, 407.

*Fathers* of the Christian Church, notice of some fanciful expositions of Scripture by, 283—their evidence to the doctrine of the Trinity, 276, 277—their silence often as valuable as their testimony, 304.

*Fawkes* (Guido), examination of, relative to the gunpowder plot, 117—119.

*Food*, on the nature of, 346, 347.

*France*, state of parties in, in 1789, 7, 8, 9—the Tiers-Etat refuse to assemble in the same hall with the nobles, 14—decare themselves the National Assembly, *ib.* 15—speech of Mirabeau on that occasion, 15—effects of the measure on the French nobility, *ib.*—Louis XVI. holds a royal session or bed of justice, 16—refusal of the Tiers-Etat to separate, *ib.*—speech of Mirabeau on that occasion, 17—observations on it, *ib.*—and on the conduct of the club Bréton, 18—the public creditors of France, why the partisans of the states general, 19—Mirabeau's address to the King for the dismissal of the troops, *ib.*—remarks on the address from the National Assembly to the people, 21—on the folly of the declaration of the rights of man, 23—and on the decrees passed by the Assembly, on the 4th of August, 23—25—debates on the absolute veto, 25—on the proposal of M. Necker for a loan, 28—splendid speech of Mirabeau on that occasion, 29—debate on the proposal for proclaiming martial

law, 30, 31—remarks on the character of Louis XVI. 40, 41.

*Futurity*, opinions of the ancients concerning, 224, 225.

## G.

*Gascoigne's* and *Kinwelmarsh's* tragedy of *Jocasta*, 373, 374—specimens of it, 374.

*Genesis* (Book of), philosophical illustration of the first chapter, 77—83.

*Giacomelli* (Antonio), biographical notice of, 376, 377.

*Greek Drama*, notice of the first attempt to introduce upon the English stage, 373. See *Æschylus*, *Euripides*, and *Sophocles*.

*Gregory's* Dialogues, extraordinary death-bed scenes portrayed in, 351—355.

*Grinding* at the mill, oriental mode of, 98.

## H.

*Hall* (Capt. Basil), *Adventure* of, in Iceland, 89, 90—his reflections on setting sail for India, 91—account of a Sunday on shipboard, 92, 93—his observations on the condition of sailors 93, 94—description of a north-wester off the Cape of Good Hope, 94, 95.

*Hall* (Rev. George), extract from his Sermon on the Fast Day, to prove that the pestilence was inflicted on account of the opposition made to the Reform Bill, 166—168—on the licentiousness of the press, 168, 169.

*Harford* (Dr. J. S.), his character of the tragedies of *Æschylus*, 380, 381—character of his version of the *Agamemnon*, 378, 379.

*Harley* (Robert), Earl of Oxford, instructions of, to one of his agents, for the purchase of manuscripts, 106, 107—amount of his collection, 106, 108.

*Hayley's* Life of Milton, character of, 45, 46.

*Hebrew* scholarships at Oxford, regulations of, 248, 249.

*Hieroglyphics*, observations on MM. Champollions' discoveries in, 138, 139.

*Hindoos*, integrity of, during a famine, 99—their astronomical epoch of the Calî Yuga, 120, 121.

*History* of Britain, outline of a plan for a collection of materials for, 116.

*Humanitarians*, remarks on the conduct of, in the Trinitarian Controversy, 259,

260—their ignorance in attempting to evade the force of evidence furnished by the New Testament to the Trinitarian doctrine, 293, 294. See *Trinitarianism*.

## I.

*Inscriptions* on the tombs of the Scipios, 224, 225—and on the arch of Titus, 227.

## J.

*James I.*, interrogatories proposed by, for the examination of Guy Fawkes, 117, 118—and Fawkes's replies thereto, 118, 119.

*Jerusalem* (Church of), on the observance of the Mosaic law by, 301, 302.

*JESUS CHRIST*, testimonies of ancient fathers to the worship of, 276—and to his divinity, 278.

*Johnson* (Rev. Arthur), plan of his "Christus Crucifixus," 169, 170—summary of his argument, 170—172.

*Johnson's* (Dr. Samuel), *Life of Milton*, character of, 44, 45.

*Josephus's* account of the triumphal procession of Titus, 227.

*Julian Period*, account of the epoch of, 123.

*Juvenile Offenders*, remarks on, 470—472.

## L.

*Labour*, advantage of the division of, in the manufacture of pins, 149, 150.

*Lansdowne* collection of manuscripts, account of, 108.

*Letters*, suggestion for the conveyance of, by machinery, 154, 155.

*Lindsey*, strictures on the conduct of, in the Socinian controversy, 298, 299.

*Liturgies* of the ancient Church, testimonies of, to the doctrine of the Trinity, 279, 280.

*Louis XVI.*, remarks on the character of, 40, 41—bed of justice, held by him, 16.

## M.

*Machinery* and manufactures, advantages derived from, by the addition they make to human power, 143—by the economy of time, *ib.* 144—and the conversion of apparently worthless sub-

stances into valuable products, 144—improvements in typography, effected by mechanism, 144, 145.

*Manufactures*, advantage of the division of labour in, illustrated in the manufacture of pins, 148—150.

*Manuscripts*, Cottonian collection of, amount of, 105—of the Harleian collection, 106—108—and of the Lansdowne collection, 108.

*Marriages* of clergymen, list of, 490.

*Medea* of Euripides, analysis of, 389—391.

*Medicine*, state of, among the Mussulmans of India, 409, 410.

*Medwin* (J.) pretensions of, as a translator of Æschylus, 379—remarks on his version of the Agamemnon, 380—specimens of his version of the Prometheus, 384—385.

*Meer Hadjee Shah*, biographical account of, 403—406.

*Meer Hassan Ali* (Mrs.), her description of a private audience of the Great Mogul, 339, 400—anecdotes of her Mahomedan father-in-law, 403—407.

*Milton's* biographers, characters of, Phillips and Toland, 43—Richardson, *ib.*—Dr. Birch, *ib.* 44—Dr. Johnson, 44, 45—Mr. Hayley, 45, 46—remarks on Cowper's translations from Milton's Latin Poems, 46, 47—character of Mr. Todd's *Life of Milton*, 47—strictures on Dr. Symmons's *Life*, 48—50—character of Mr. Mitford's *Life*—probable reasons why Milton did not enter the Ministry of the Church of England, 51—reasons for concluding that he entertained no firmly grounded religious opinions, 51, 52—genuineness of his *Treatise of Theology*, 52—remarks on it, 52—54—on his *Treatise on Education*, 56—58—on his love of liberty, 59—his view of the state of society in his time, applicable to the present time, 60—beautiful passage in his *Areopagitica*, 61—remarks on Mr. Mitford's edition of his poetical works, 62, 63—and on Milton's genius, 63, 61.

*Mirabeau* (Count), character of, 3, 4, 7—attaches M. Dumont to himself, 4, 5—his colloquial fascinations, 5—his extraordinary literary industry, 5, 6—description of his personal appearance, 9—his interview with M. Necker, with a view to admission into office, 10—splendid burst of eloquence in the National Assembly, 11—his speech on proposing that the French Commons should organize themselves under the

- title of Deputies of the French people, 14, 15—his speech on the refusal of the Tiers-Etat to separate, 17—remarks on it, *ib.*—his address to the King for the dismissal of the troops, written by M. Dumont, 19—in conjunction with whom he commences the *Journal de Provence*, 20—remarks on its execution, *ib.* 21—his blunder in the debate on the absolute veto, 26—how far he was implicated in the events of the 5th and 6th of October, 27, 28—specimen of his splendid speech in support of M. Necker's plan for a loan, 29, 30—supports the proposal of the French Court for proclaiming martial law, 30, 31—his sentiments concerning the French clergy, 31—pensioned by the Court, 32—his conduct, as President of the Assembly, 32—his valedictory address to M. Dumont, and death, 33—agonies of his last illness, *ib.*—review of his moral character, 34—of his mental powers, 35, 36—venality, 37—political sagacity, *ib.* 38—anecdotes of his private life, 38, 39.
- Mitford* (Rev. John), character of his Life of Milton, 50—his opinion on Milton's religious principles, 54, 55—observations on his illustrations of Milton's poetical works, 62, 63.
- Molé*, a French actor, anecdote of, 30.
- Money*, distinction between the degradation and the depreciation of, 337, 338—effect of a change in the currency, and variations in the value of money, as affecting the prices of labour and commodities, 338—340.
- Morals* (public), gross neglect of, by the government, 465—were watched by the ancient Courts Christian, *ib.*—necessity of efficient measures being adopted by the government, 467, 468.
- Mortimer* (Rev. Thomas), address of, to the Lord Mayor, 172, 173—his denunciation of Mr. Hume's profaneness, 173, 174—remark thereon, 174.
- Moses* proved to be the author of the Pentateuch, 75—compiled the Book of Genesis from the records of patriarchal families, *ib.* 76—remarks on the Mosaic cosmogony, 77—83—and on the observance of the Mosaic law by the Hebrew Church at Jerusalem, until its dispersion in the time of Adrian, 301, 302.
- Mugganee*, or first contract of a Moham-medan wedding, described, 408, 409.
- Munday* (Captain), his description of Lord Combermere's audience of the Great Mogul, 400—402—of a tiger hunt, 411, 412—anecdotes of an Anglo-Indian, 413—of the Begum Sumroo, 413, 414.
- Mure* (William, Esq.), abstract of his examination and refutation of MM. Champollions' theory concerning the era of Sesostris, 124—130—remarks on his own conclusions as to the true date of that era, 130—131—abstract of his observations on the Egyptian calendar and Zodiac, 132—137.
- Mussulmaun* fast, rigour of, 407—ignorance of the Mussulmaun women in India, *ib.* 408—nuptial contract of, 408, 409—their ignorance of medicine, 409, 410.
- Mysteries*, observation on the discipline of, in the ancient Christian Church, 281, 282.

## N.

*Nicene Creed*, origin of, 268.

## O.

*Ordinations* of clergymen, lists of, 236—238.

*Origen's* testimony to the plenary adoration of Christ, examined, 294, 295.

*Oxford University*, number of the members of, 249—degrees, conferred, 243—246, 491, 492—regulations of the Pusey and Ellerton Hebrew scholarships, 248, 249—prizes offered, 493—miscellaneous university intelligence, 246, 247, 492, 493.

## P.

*Parliamentary Writs*, uses of, 111.

*People* of England, effects of the Reform Bill on, 431—inadequacy of the measures hitherto adopted for improving them, 432, 433—necessity of further measures, 433—436—observations of Dr. Southey on the means hitherto adopted, 436—439—defective state of the education of the people, 440, 441—neglect of national education at the reformation, 442—efforts of the National Society and of the schools in connexion with it, 443—necessity of a general visiting of the poor, 444, 445—Mr. Courtenay's plan for taking the children of the poor from their parents, 445—447—remarks on it, 447—necessity of enlarging the course of instruc-

tion given to the poor, 447, 448—its practicability evinced in the sessional schools in Edinburgh, 449.

*Pevensey*, notice of an important agricultural experiment at, 476.

*Philips's*, Life of Milton, character of, 43.

*Pins*, improvement in the manufacture of, by the division of labour, 149, 150.

*Pipe Rolls*, account of, 109—estimate of their value, 117—specimen of one, *ib.*

*Political Economy*, why not a popular subject of study, 306, 307—the last or worst description of soil under cultivation, why generally unprofitable to its proprietor, 309—311—though in many cases it may be profitably entered upon, 311, 312—the labourer in reality is better off when he earns only one-third of what he produces, in a full state of employment, than when he earns one-half of it, with only half employment, 312—on the increase and limit of employment, 314—320—the possibility of over-production, 321, 322—how far foreign trade adds to the wealth of a country, and is a source of maintenance to the people, 322—324—who are unproductive labourers, 333, 334.

*Poor*, the general visitation of, recommended, 441, 445—beneficial effects which would result from it, 466, 467—Dr. Chalmers's plan of providing for the poor in Glasgow, 451—its beneficial results, 451—453—remarks thereon, 453, 454—successful experiment tried by Mr. Walker at Stretford, in the parish of Manchester, 454, 456—observations thereon, 456—his suggestions for the reduction of pauperism, 457, 458—remarks thereon, 459, 460.

*Potter's* translation of *Æschylus*, character of, 378.

*Power* (human), addition made to, by machinery, 143.

*Prayer*, Milton's opinion of, 51, 52—remarks on the importance of, 359, 360.

*Preferments* of clergymen, lists of, 232—236, 483—487.

*Press*, observations on the licentiousness of, 168, 169.

*Pressure*, application of, to the engraving of copper-plates, 146—148.

*Priestley* (Dr.), canons of, for ascertaining the testimony of antiquity concerning the person of Christ, 263, 264—remarks thereon, 264—his fruitless endeavour to press Justin Martyr into the service of the Humanitarians, 277—his mode of evading the testimony of certain texts

of Scripture, 283—reprobation of his misrepresentation of the testimony of Hegeippus to the divinity of Christ, 284—287—and of his assertion that the common people among the first Christians did not believe in the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, 288—290—on his interpretation of Acts vii. 59, 294—coincidence between his creed and that of Mohammedism, 297.

*Printing*, improvements in the art of, by machinery, 144, 145.

*Prisons*, defective state of various, exposed, 460, 461—pitiable condition of juvenile offenders, 464—466.

*Prophecy*, observations on the chain of, 162, 163.

*Prynne*, (William) his account of his labours in sorting the records in the Tower, 110—on the value and uses of parliamentary writs, 111.

*Pusey and Ellerton*, Hebrew scholarships, regulations of, 248, 249.

## R.

*Records* of the Romans, account of, 103—and of the Cottonian collection of records, 104, 105—of the Harleian collection, 106—108—of the Lansdowne MSS., 108—of the Pipe rolls, 109—of the Valor Ecclesiasticus, 109—of Rymer's *Fœdera*, 112—114.

*Reform Bill*, considerations on the effects of, 429, 430—particularly on the people of England, 431, 432.

*Rent*, nature and effects of, 341—343.

*Renwick's* (Professor), attempt to ascertain the earliest date of Egyptian colonization, 139—141.

*Robespierre*, anecdote of, 12, 13.

*Rome*, state of, at the restoration of learning, 197—notice of various writers on its antiquities, 198, 199—different modes of division of, at various times, 202, 203—description of Rome and its environs, as seen from the Capitoline Hill, 204—208—Poggio's description of Rome, 208, 209—account of the discovery of the Temple of Concord, 209, 210—probable date of its destruction, 211—opinions of antiquaries on the situation of the citadel, 212—Mr. Burgess's opinion, 213, 214—and on the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, 214, 215—sketch of its history, 215, 216—description of the temple of Venus and Rome, 217—220—descrip-



tion of the Appian Way, 222—tomb of the Scipios, 223—copies of inscriptions on it, 224, 225—observations on the triumphal arch of Titus, 226—231.

*Rymer's Fœdera*, account of the several editions of, 112—and of the present state of the new edition of, 113, 114.

## S.

*Sabbath*, observations on the disregard of, 175—how it is to be kept holy, 176, 177.

*Salvini*, (Antonio Maria) biographical notice of, 375, 376.

*Scipios* tomb of, described, 223—225.

*Serinia Viatoria* and *Stataria* of the Romans, account of, 103.

*Scripture*, illustration of, 98—sense of, how to be ascertained, 260, 261.

*Sectarianism*, operations of, delineated, 364—370.

*Selfishness*, workings of, described, 178, 179.

*Sesostris*, observations on MM. Champollions' theory of the era of, 124—130—and on Mr. Mure's conclusions concerning the true date of that era, 130, 131.

*Shuttleworth* (Rev. Dr.), design of his work on the consistency of Revelation, 159—observations of, on the destruction of the Canaanites, 159—161—on the chain of prophecy, 162, 163—on the effects of a cordial belief of Christianity, 163, 164—on the duties of a Christian teacher, 165.

*Siéyes* (Abbé), biographical notice of, 13.

*Sophocles*, general comparison of, with *Æschylus*, 386, 387—particularly of his *Electra*, 393.

*Succession*, benefits of the law of, 335, 336.

*Sundays*, how employed, in high life, 362, 363.

*Syaads*, or descendants of Mohammed, privileges of, 402.

*Symmonds's* (Rev. Dr.) Life of Milton, remarks on, 48—50—his observations on Milton's love of liberty, 59.

## T.

*Taxes*, effects of, 325—329.

*Temple* of Concord, at Rome, account of, 209—211—of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, 214—216—and of Venus and Rome, 217—220.

*Texts of Scripture* illustrated :—

Gen. i. 1—10 ..... 77, 78

—— 11 ..... 79

—— 14—19 ..... 79, 80

—— 20, 21 ..... 81, 82

—— 24, 25 ..... 82, 83

Exod. xxv. 23, 24—31, 32. .... 228

Numb. x. 1, 2 ..... 228

Deut. iv. 2 ..... 229

—— xviii. .... *ibid.*

—— xxxii. 9—11 ..... *ibid.*

Josh. xxiv. 26 ..... 229

2 Chron. xxxiv. 3—14 ..... 229

Dan. ix. 11—13 ..... 230

Matt. ix. 6 ..... 98

—— xxiv. 41 ..... *ibid.*

John iv. 7 ..... *ibid.*

Acts vii. 59 ..... 294

*Time*, economy of, increased by machinery, 143, 144.

*Tithes*, on whom they really fall, 332—on the commutation of, 333.

*Titus*, observations on the triumphal arch of, 226, 227—and on various passages of Scripture illustrated by it, 228—231.

*Todd's* (Rev. H.) Life of Milton, character of, 47.

*Toland's* life of Milton, character of, 43.

*Transportation* of criminals, considerations on, 469, 470.

*Trinitarian controversy*, remarks on the conduct of the Humanitarians in, 259, 260—the ancient doctors of the church, the best guide in determining the belief of the church, 261—notice of the previous publications of Bishops Bull and Horsley, 262—belief of the first Christians on this point, 263, and *note*—remarks on some peculiarities of the modern anti-trinitarian school, 271—testimonies of the fathers to the doctrine of the Trinity, 276, 277—of the ancient public documents of the Christian churches, 278—of creeds and symbols, 279—of liturgies and doxologies, 280—from the discipline of the mysteries, 281, 282—from the unanimous primitive interpretations of texts now litigated, 283, 284—this doctrine not first introduced by Justin Martyr, 290—292.

*Trypho*, sentiments of, on the humanity of Christ, 296, 297.

*Turner* (Sharon), remarks on his 'Sacred History of the World,' 64, 65—investigation of his account of the creation of the earth, 69—on his theory that the work of creation was completed in six natural days, 70—and on his geological account

of the formation of the different strata, 84—86—specimens of his style, 86, 87.

## U.

*Unitarians*, on the assumption of the term, by the modern Socinians, 298, 299—See *Humanitarians*.

*Universities*, proceedings of : — Oxford, 243—250—491—493 — Cambridge, 251—256—493—496.

## V.

*Valor Ecclesiasticus*, notice of, 109.

*Venetian History*, sources of, 417, 418—character of 'Sketches from Venetian History,' 418—embassy of the Crusaders of France to the Doge and Senate of Venice, 419, 420—siege and capture of Constantinople by the Venetians in conjunction with the Crusaders, 422—428.

*Visitation*, general, of the poor recommended, 444, 445—beneficial effects which would result from it, 466, 467.

*Walker* (Thomas, Esq.), his successful experiment at Stretford, of providing

for the poor, and diminishing pauperism, 454—456—remarks thereon, 457—his further suggestions for the reduction of pauperism, 457, 458 — observations thereon, 459, 460.

## W.

*Water*, oriental mode of fetching, 98.

*Whateley* (Archbishop), censures of, on transportation, 469, 470—observations thereon, 470—his remarks on juvenile offenders, 470—472—and on criminal lunatics, 472, 473—strictures thereon, 474—suggestions of, for the employment of convicts, and the appointment of a commission for penitentiary purposes, 475—477.

*Women* in India, ignorance of, 407, 408.

*Wood* (John), abstract of his account of the Edinburgh Sessional School, 185—195.

*Wood* (Rev. William), observations of, on the observance of the Sabbath, 175—177.

## Z.

*Zodiac* of the Egyptians, observations on, 132—136.



XXIII C. 9

THE

# BRITISH CRITIC,

## Quarterly Theological Review,

AND

### ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

 OCTOBER, 1829.
 

---

- ART. I.—1. *Letters on the Church.* By an Episcopalian. 1826. 7s.  
 2. *An Inquiry concerning the Means and Expedience of proposing and making any Change in the Canons, Articles, or Liturgy, or in any of the Laws affecting the Interests of the Church of England.* By William Winstanley Hull. Oxford. 1828. 7s.  
 3. *Church Reform.* By a Churchman. London. 1828. 6s. 6d.

WE have seldom met with a publication which has reduced us to greater perplexity in the attempt to ascertain the true character, disposition, and design of the author, than the above *Letters on the Church*. We have sometimes been tempted to suppose that the writer must belong to some one of the multiform varieties of Dissent which the vigorous soil of this country produces in such rank abundance: for the avowed object of his whole work is to recommend a scheme of discipline and government which resembles theirs in one main feature,—namely, its high disdain of all connection between the Church of Christ and the powers of this world. But then, on the other hand, we find that the author writes himself *Episcopalian*; and moreover, that he is potent and uncompromising in his vindication of tithes, and of every species of ecclesiastical property, to a degree that might be thought well nigh treasonable to the cause of separation. At other times we have been almost lured into the belief that we had to deal with a Papist in disguise: and to this conjecture we were led partly by the recollection, that shortly after the publication of these *Letters*, the incomparable Dr. Doyle\* was found labouring to persuade the Protestant world, that the only duty of a Christian state towards the Christian religion, is to treat all modifications of that religion with magnanimous impartiality, and to extend to them all the fullest

\* In the Reply by J. K. L. to the Charge of the Archbishop of Dublin. 1827.

protection from insult and aggression, and nothing more. With this recent instance in our memory, we could not, for some time, feel confident that we had not, in the writer before us, a concealed advocate for the scheme of reducing Protestant Episcopacy to the same dead level of religious liberty and equality, which is now the lot of every form of dissent in these kingdoms; and this, in order that the ground might thus be better cleared for the operations of the Queen and Mother of Churches, who has never yet renounced her claim of dominion over all principalities and powers, whether temporal or spiritual. From our apprehensions, however, of the writer's attachment to Popery, we must confess that we were speedily driven by the good set terms in which he rails against the Lady of the Seven Hills, and reprobates the doctrine of the deposing power as subversive of society. For though it is not beyond the perfidy of an accomplished Jesuit to assume this sort of language, as a mask for treacherous hostility, yet one is unwilling, on any but the strongest grounds, to ascribe to any writer the turpitude of such double-dyed imposture. There remains, therefore, nothing but the supposition that the author is, really, what he gives himself out for—both Protestant and Episcopalian. But, as it is evident that he is not Episcopalian after the Anglican use and fashion, we are compelled to seek in some other region for the school in which he has learned his principles of Ecclesiastical Government. We must direct our thoughts to a land, in which Episcopacy is not allowed to claim the supremacy due to an immediate derivation from Apostolic usage; and in which, consequently, the government of bishops is regarded merely as one among many modes of administering the Church, and consequently as having a right, in common with the rest, to nothing more than bare protection at the hand of the civil magistrate. We know not, therefore, well where to look but across the Atlantic for the quarter from which these accents of solemn urgency have issued, calling upon the English Church to abjure her post in the British constitution; or (if she cannot, by any exertion, rid herself of her splendid servitude) at least to lift up the voice of a perpetual protest and testimony against it, as an intolerable grievance and degradation.

We hope to be forgiven, if we venture just to state as a fact, that when the surmise first occurred to us, that this work might probably have its origin in a country where the Church and the State were totally severed from each other, there did start up in our remembrance the ancient story of a certain sagacious animal, who had accidentally been disencumbered of his goodly brush. Immediately upon this casualty, it will be recollected, he was seized with a prodigious impatience to persuade his brethren that they would find inexpressible relief and comfort from the absence

of that most inconvenient and unseemly appendage; and that they could not better consult the dignity of their species than by unanimously consenting to its amputation. And if the course of lectures had fortunately been preserved to us, whereby this eminent reformer attempted so great a revolution, we should doubtless have seen it proved, for the satisfaction of the astute fraternity, that nature never had disgraced their aboriginal generations with such an ignoble incumbrance—that this excrescence had been produced in the course of ages by ease, and sloth, and unnatural diet, and luxurious habits—and that, if they were desirous of recovering the activity and the comeliness of their forefathers, they must begin by casting away that piece of pompous deformity. The brotherhood were, however, most provokingly obstinate. In spite of all the patriot could urge, they left him to the solitary honours of his own discovery; they continued to glory in their shame; and to this day their posterity remain incorrigible. We are sadly fearful that the anxiety of the Episcopalian, to reduce our Church to primitive simplicity and succinctness, will be no better rewarded than the labours of the illustrious projector in question. The *operation* he recommends is, in truth, an exceedingly desperate and perilous one: and we can scarcely persuade ourselves that it would have been urged by one who had successfully studied our *constitution*.

We shall, however, weary our readers with no further surmises or conjectures as to the country or the Church which claims the honour of this production. Whether its author be Protestant or Papist—whether he be Prelatist or Sectarian—whether he be British or Transatlantic—whether his intents be wicked or charitable—one thing we hold to be clear:—namely, that either he has a singular inaptitude for all exercises of the reasoning faculty; or that the culture bestowed by him on that faculty has been remarkably infelicitous. And in order that our readers may be enabled to ascertain whether or not this judgment of ours be rash and hasty, we shall proceed to lay before them the process by which he endeavours to establish his main position—that there is something unlawful in any connection, union, or alliance between the Church of Christ and any temporal government on earth.

It must be remembered, then, that when our Saviour appeared on earth, his countrymen, after the flesh, were wrapped up, with all their souls and faculties, in the persuasion, that their Messiah would be a warrior and a conqueror—that he would found a splendid empire upon the ruins of heathen states—that he would fulfil the promise, that *the sons of the alien should be ploughmen and vine-dressers to the children of Israel*—that he would be prepared to sweep away all resistance with a mighty hand and an

uplifted arm—and that they, who should attempt to arrest his course, would have nothing to expect but fire and steel as the chastisement of their presumption. All these visions of grandeur and of vengeance were dissolved by the command of the holy Jesus, that his followers should put up their swords into their scabbards; and by his declaration, at the judgment-seat of Pilate, that his kingdom was not of this world!

The import of these words of our Saviour is too obvious to be mistaken. We have only to advert to the views and expectations of the persons in the midst of whom they were uttered, and we are instantly in possession of a key to their exact meaning.\* The object of the speaker was not indeed to disclaim the title of a king, but rather to claim that title in a more august and mysterious sense than it ever entered into their hearts to conceive. The dispensation he came to establish would have for its object the moral regeneration of the world, and the salvation of immortal souls; and this blessed purpose would be carried on under his personal controul and mediatorial sovereignty, even until the end of time.

Now, from these very simple premises, what is the conclusion derived by this writer? He is not satisfied with contending that the Messiah's sovereignty has for its objects the glory of God, and the moral and spiritual interests of man; but he maintains that this great design is to be kept totally and scrupulously free from all contact of secular interest or polity; Christ's kingdom, he iterates throughout his pages, is not of this world; *therefore* his Church, though planted *in* this world, is to have no sort of connection with the civil or temporal authorities of the world. It is to accept of nothing more than mere protection; such protection as every other society of men, and every other class of interests, are entitled to receive at the hand of the magistrate: but it is to accept of nothing more than this. It is positively to reject all special aid, or countenance, or support from the state: and, above all things, it is to shrink—as it would from infamy and contamination—from all such assistance as might imply the slightest right to interfere in the humblest or most ministerial

\* “ *My kingdom is not of this world* are very indeterminable words, and capable of several meanings if we consider them in themselves. But as soon as we consider them as an answer to a particular question, they take one determinate sense. The question was, whether our Saviour was the (temporal) king of the Jews? Jesus answered, ‘ *My kingdom is not of this world.*’ Now, as these words may signify no more than the denial of what was asked; as there is nothing in them that necessarily implies more than that he was not a king, as the Jewish or other temporal kings are; as the question extends the answer no farther than this meaning, so if we enlarge it, or fix any other meaning on it, it is all human reasoning without any warrant from the text.”—*Law's Second Letter to Bishop Hoadley.*

department of the Church's polity. The temporal prince, it would seem, has no right to lay so much as a finger upon the staves of her ark, even though it were to save it from downfall; and the intruder would deserve but little else than the cleaving curse of a perpetual leprosy for his inheritance. And as for the servile and mercenary priests who should tamely endure such profanation, we know not well what retribution could be adequate to their treachery, unless the ground should be cleft asunder to swallow up them and their children. All this he has said, not perhaps exactly in the language in which we have here set it down, but in terms which cannot fairly be held to imply any less formidable and portentous conclusion.

Now we protest, without hesitation, that we do not recollect to have met, in the whole course of our critical labours, with a more prodigious paralogism than that which we have just set forth. The kingdom of Christ is not of this world: therefore the kings of the world are, *as such*, absolved from all obligation whatever to support, encourage, or advance the religion of Christ. Whenever the rabble wanted to make Jesus a king, he escaped from their ignorant zeal; and therefore princes and magistrates must forbear to desecrate his Church by any outward attributes of honour and veneration. Our Lord forbade his followers to fight for him: therefore it is but profane usurpation for a temporal sovereign to style himself Defender of the Faith. One can hardly imagine it needful to commence a serious refutation of this strange extravagance. If it were necessary, however, we know not how it might be more effectually accomplished than by resorting to a supposition, which may surely be made without the slightest impropriety or irreverence. Let us but venture for a moment to imagine that He, who uttered the words which form our author's text, had seen fit to follow them up by something of an explanation or commentary, and this for the purpose of guarding those words from all possible misapprehension. And let us conceive him to have taken for the basis of such commentary that illustrious Scripture which foretold that kings should be the nursing fathers to his visible Church, and that queens should be its nursing mothers; and to declare that this oracle pointed out to the great ones of the earth the duty which, in all climes and in all ages, they would owe to that holy assembly:—that they would not be called on to spread her dominion with bow or with spear, but that it would be at their peril that they stinted her of the honours which were due to her; that she must be regarded as a sacred portion of the charge consigned to them as powers ordained of God; and that they must consider her interests as indissolubly woven with those of their earthly domains;—in short, that in every realm where the Gospel



should be embraced, the state and the Church should, for many purposes, be one with each other. Let it, we repeat, be only imagined for a moment that a solemn charge like this had been given at the very same time that the words were spoken, which claimed for the Messiah a kingdom which *was not* of this world;—would there, we confidently ask, have been anything in the tenor of that charge which could righteously be said to point to a kingdom which *was* of this world? Could it have been plausibly said, by the most intrepid adversary of revelation, that the Nazarene took up with one hand what he had thrown away with the other? And would the most scrupulous interpreter of Scripture have found the slightest difficulty in perceiving, or in maintaining, the difference between a kingdom, secular in all its objects and all its administrations, and a dispensation which, however spiritual in its nature and its purposes, demands nevertheless the reverence, the service, and the support of monarchs and of states?

By way of further, though perhaps almost superfluous, elucidation, let us have recourse to another imaginary case. When Socrates propounded at Athens his principles of moral philosophy, he may, truly enough, be said to have proposed to himself an Empire of the grandest sort over the *minds* of men; an empire incomparably more noble than any mere political domination that can be imagined. Now, let us imagine that the people of Athens, after having murdered their benefactor and instructor, had tardily awakened to a sense of his worth, and of the glorious properties of the wisdom which he taught. We may, then, easily conceive them, in conformity with these new views and feelings, resolved to spare neither exertion nor expense in propagating it through their country. We may fancy them lavishing honours, privileges, and emoluments upon its teachers, and even regarding them as worthy of a seat in their National Councils. We may conceive them founding schools and institutions for the perpetuation of this doctrine, and ranking its protection and encouragement as among the primary objects of their polity. We may figure them to ourselves as giving the amplest license and permission to other sects, but as treating this peculiar class with the distinction due to persons devoted to the highest interests of mankind. We may, in short, imagine them giving, in the fullest sense, an *establishment* to the Socratic philosophy, and considering that establishment as the Palladium, in which was wrapped up the virtue of their citizens, and the *true* prosperity and grandeur of their country. And if they *had* felt and acted thus, what entertainment are we to think that they would have given to one of their orators, who should have risen to tell them, that all these proceedings were but an incumbrance to the very cause which they were so anxious to

honour and to advance—that they were converting a moral influence into something akin to political authority and sovereignty—that they were departing from the spirit, if not from the positive injunction, of the Founder of this renowned school—that if he were living he would be the first to deprecate and abjure this monstrous mixture of civil and moral controul: nay, that he would absolutely disdain that his philosophy should hold divided empire with the mere visible and tangible expedients of human government or patronage! What, we would again ask, would be the reception to be expected by the ingenious propounder of these notions from the *Socratic* Legislators and Judges of Athens? Their first impulse, we apprehend, might be to order the reformer a draught of the same *cicuta* wherewith they had destroyed the Martyr; and the utmost that he could hope from their clemency would surely be, that they might agree to commute it for a most tremendous dose of hellebore!

Now, to say the truth, the symptoms exhibited by our Episcopalian appear to us to *indicate* a mode of treatment somewhat similar to that which would possibly have been the lot of the Attic Puritan whom we have imagined above. For, let us once more advert to what it is which throughout his work he is incessantly urging us to accomplish. For ages we have been living under a system in which man is treated as a being to whom religion is indispensable: a system which embraces his eternal as well as his perishable interests. We have been under the protection of a constitution which contemplates the whole community as Christian; which regards the ancient primitive Episcopal Church as an integral part of itself, but which at the same time gives ample security and protection to those who may unhappily have fallen away from her. We have been reared in the firm belief that such a constitution is, under Providence, a most powerful instrument for the preservation of religious faith and knowledge, and is in essential conformity with the discernible purposes and dispensations of the Almighty. But we are now to learn, that up to this moment we have been egregiously and fatally in error; that we have been impiously yoking a celestial courser to one of mortal race; that our career has, as might be expected, been perpetually wavering between heaven above and earth beneath; and that this unequal pairing must be discontinued, or that we shall incur the displeasure of God, and the contempt of man. We are told that there must be a total separation between profane and sacred things; that, in short, the State and the Church must fairly be divorced from each other, and released from a union, which to the one is desecration, to the other weakness and danger! And when we ask for what reason it is, that we are to venture

upon this tremendous experiment,—upon a change which *makes void the counsel*, and discredits the piety of former ages? the answer is—because, truly, the Founder of Christianity declared expressly that he had no thoughts whatever of dragging Cæsar from his throne,—forbade his followers to take up arms in his defence when his persecutors laid hands upon him,—and disclaimed all intention of employing fire and sword for the establishment of his faith or his dominion! Christ's kingdom is not of this world,—therefore our princes and rulers are, in their public character and station, to give themselves no thought for Christ's dispensation; they are to institute and to cherish no establishments for its diffusion and preservation; they are to render it no honours; they are to do nothing which can show that they think it a concern worth their attention, or within their province! That Christ forbade his followers to draw the temporal sword, is one proposition—that the Church and the State are to continue, to the end of time, two perfectly distinct and independent Societies, is another proposition; but it is beyond our sagacity to imagine what may be the connection between them, unless it may be represented to us by the ingenious comparison between the river in Macedon and the river in Monmouth. To be sure, it *may, by possibility*, turn out that the union between our Ecclesiastical and Civil Polity is an unnatural and monstrous anomaly; it *may*, perhaps, be shown that the bond which has hitherto connected them is no better than the effect of some vile sorcery; and the time *may* come when that unholy spell shall be broken for ever: but, if this *is* ever to be accomplished, we may very confidently pronounce that the Episcopalian is not the champion for whom the adventure is reserved.

It is, however, here necessary to apprise the reader, by way of caution, that he may possibly find himself, at first, a good deal perplexed in his endeavours to detect the infirmities of this writer's logic; because he has contrived, with some ingenuity, to identify, to all appearance, his own views with certain principles which find an echo in every humane and honest heart. The feelings of every Protestant in the present age are up in arms at the very mention of religious persecution; that is, of persecution merely for any set of opinions, which may be deemed *theologically erroneous* by the party which is *strong* enough to oppress: and these generous and truly Christian emotions he has attempted to enlist against religious establishments, as if they were all, by their very nature, the nurseries of persecution; as if persecution in some of its forms and gradations entered, unavoidably, into the discipline, constitution, and essence of every Church, which had desecrated and prostituted itself by any connection with the Civil Power! Now

this is a doctrine against which, with all our faculties, we protest. Persecution for mere religious opinions, is not necessary to the existence, the strength, or the honour of any Established Church; and the Established Church of our own country exists at this moment, in strength and honour, without it. For the truth of this statement we might, very safely and confidently, appeal to the Dissenters themselves; the most enlightened and intelligent of whom scruple not to allow that the existing system provides most nobly for freedom of conscience; and who are ready to avow, without hesitation or reserve, that they should bitterly deprecate the destruction of our Establishment, because that Establishment affords a protection, to all the peaceable varieties of religious persuasion, more complete than they could reasonably hope for under any other scheme of polity. Such, we firmly believe,—such, we might almost say, we positively know,—to be the sentiments of the most reflecting and best-informed among those who are separate from our communion. But what of that? The most explicit testimony to that effect from the whole body of Dissenters would probably go for nothing, in the estimate of a head bewildered with the reveries of the Episcopalian. Whatever the English Church may be *in practice*, in *theory*, he contends, she is still as much a persecuting Church as the Church of Rome. “The Inquisition,” he tells us, “is no *part* of Popery. Why then should it not exist in a Protestant country? And what disclaimer is there in the Articles of the English Church of all right to erect or to sanction such a tribunal? What denial of all authority in Christian princes to restrain religious offenders by the civil sword?”\* And where on the face of our Articles, we may just as reasonably ask, is any disclaimer to be found, of all right to burn aged, poor, and solitary females for the crime of witchcraft, an offence which is very nearly as much of an ecclesiastical and spiritual nature as heresy or schism? And where is there, in her formularies, a sentence which condemns this remnant of a stupid and merciless superstition? And how is she, therefore, to defend herself against the charge of betraying, by her silence, the cause of humanity and common sense? The true and substantial answer to all such objections will occur, in an instant, to every mind not absolutely perverted by hatred of the existing system: the practice of roasting misbelievers, as well as crazy old women, has long been abolished by our *Christian* legislature; and measures for completing the great scheme of religious freedom have been in constant progress from the period of the Reformation till the present day. To these measures the Church, as an integral portion of the State, must, in all justice, be considered as a party;

\* P. 42.

so that both Church and State have by this time fully redeemed themselves from whatever infamy may attach to the practice of enforcing uniformity by the dungeon, the faggot, or the rack. Every candid reader of our ecclesiastical history will recollect that, at the period of our reformation, the privilege of defection from the national belief was not recognised by any Christian government in Europe. The disregard of the rights of conscience was quite universal. The principle of persecution, therefore, was a fiery plague, some touch of which our Church inherited from her corrupt and sanguinary mother. Her better regimen, however, and her improved temperament, have gradually worn out this accursed pest, till not a particle of the infection can fairly be supposed to lurk in her constitution. Ill, then, betide that most uncharitable, most unnatural jealousy, which can gaze into her eye, and search there for a speck of the same earth-born passion which once dimmed its serenity! Ill betide the unkindly spirit which can peruse her countenance, in hopes of finding, here and there, an ingrained spot, to testify of the disease which once inflamed her vitals!

That he may not be thought, however, to confine himself wholly to uncharitable offices, the Episcopalian in another part of his work\* benevolently tenders to us a most ingenious suggestion, by virtue of which the Church may instantly entitle herself to full emancipation from her thralldom, and to an entire deliverance from all sinister suspicions. He has discovered that the supremacy of the civil magistrate was originally admitted on the condition that he should prohibit and punish all deviations from the established faith; that he should allow of no other religion; and that he should consider an offence against the Church, as an offence against the State. And he contends that this condition having long been violated on the part of the State, by the discontinuance of all coercive enforcement of conformity, the civil powers have lost all claim to control or supremacy over the ecclesiastical body; that, consequently, the Church is, *de jure*, invested with all her original freedom and independence, and that she cannot do a more wise or virtuous thing than instantly to reclaim her ancient rights. In other words, the Church is gravely recommended to address the State thus:—"Our connection began in a compact, by which I consented to become a slave, on condition that you would consent to become an executioner. Since, however, you have broken your part of the contract, and have ceased to honor me by the proscription of sectarians, all connection between us is of course at an end, and I am now my own mistress

\* P. 147, &c.

once more." And this is the language which is counselled by one who stands forward as the friend of the Church, and the champion of her dignity, and as the sworn enemy of all violence in matters pertaining to the conscience! Rather than fail in regaining her independence, the Church is openly to proclaim her own infamy, to avow that she is still at heart a dear lover of oppression, and to sue for a separation, on the ground of having been defrauded of her stipulated indulgence in this particular. We really know not how the keenest adversary of the Church could well have assailed her with more sarcastic and biting mockery. Her true friends, however, will be at no loss for a reply to these ironical and insidious solicitings. They need not scruple to concede, that in former days the freedom of conscience was not so much respected, either by Church or State, as it is at this day. But then they may also contend, irresistibly, that even if such a compact ever existed, as that which is here described, the Church has virtually waved all right to claim the execution of it. In every measure for the relief of conscience she has fully acquiesced, and she has no longer the power, even if she retained the will, to call for the performance of such hateful stipulations. She is therefore still bound—and she is still content—to continue, not in base subjection, but in dignified allegiance, to the powers that be ordained of God.

So much then for the ingenious discovery, that the elements of persecution are still floating in the seemingly mild and innocuous compound of our ecclesiastical polity, and that unforeseen casualties may even yet operate as a test which shall detect their existence, and even throw them into all fearful shapes and pernicious combinations. So much for the profound surmise, that the principles of the Inquisition are yet lurking in the British Constitution, and that we cannot be quite certain that they will never again be embodied, and brought forth into action. To indemnify the Episcopalian, however, for the demolition of this fancy, we shall, with exemplary candour and integrity, help him to another consideration, which he may possibly find in some degree more serviceable to his cause. We will honestly invite his attention to the system of our ecclesiastical judicature as it exists at this moment, founded, as it seems to be, upon the presumption, not only that every man, woman, and child in England is a member of the English Church, but that not a soul of them is at liberty to consider themselves as otherwise. It is the wisest way to be candid in this matter; for it cannot be disguised that such is the true state of the case. The process of our Spiritual Courts issues on the supposition that the persons who are the objects of it are members of the Christian community; and that the Chris-



tian community is identical with the national Establishment: and no person in the realm, be it remembered, is at liberty to plead to their jurisdiction, and to say, that he has quitted that communion; that he has entered some other religious society, to whose moral and spiritual discipline he submits himself, and that he no longer acknowledges the right of the Established Church to inflict censures or punishments upon him, for the amendment of his manners, or for the health of his soul. No person is at liberty to say this. Process of excommunication, for instance, with all its temporal consequences, may still in some instances go forth, not merely against the Churchman, but against the Quaker or the Independent, or the Presbyterian, or the member of the "*Free-thinking Church of God.*" And it will be to no purpose for them to proclaim, that to individuals of their communion a sentence of excommunication must be altogether inapplicable, since they have already separated themselves from the society which proposes to expel them. Now here, it must be allowed, we have something which looks like a formidable departure from our scheme of toleration and liberty of conscience. For certain purposes, a man is, with us, no more permitted to renounce his churchmanship, than he is to abjure his allegiance. If, therefore, the Episcopalian prefers a good palpable anomaly to a phantasmagoria of horrors, we should by all means recommend him to take his stand here; for it is here, and here only, that he will be able to find any ground for the assertion, that our *theory* of religious freedom has not yet attained its full perfection and coherency.

We advert, however, to this anomaly, without the slightest apprehension that it will be found, on examination, to involve any substantial impeachment of the Church's character for liberality and toleration; for, after all, it is quite notorious, that at present our Spiritual Courts exert, in reality, little or no power over religious opinion. A man may feel their pressure upon his time, or his patience, or his purse; but he seldom, if ever, feels it upon his conscience. Complaints, whether just or unjust, against our Ecclesiastical Law, we doubtless are accustomed to hear, and those conceived in no measured or respectful terms: but these outcries are directed, not against its bigotry and intolerance, but against its interminable process, its endless expense, and its labyrinth of chicanery. No one ever thinks about it as a spiritual grievance. As the jurisdiction of the Episcopal Courts embraces a variety of merely temporal matters, its proceedings have, in the public estimation, well nigh lost the character of spiritual inquest or infliction. Whatever it may be in theory, in practice it is, nearly to all intents and purposes, a temporal judicature. The pre-

sumption that every mortal in the realm is, whether he will or not, a member of the Church is, at the present day, often little better, in effect, than a sort of legal fiction. For the purposes of a civil action, a man is brought within the jurisdiction of the King's Bench, by a suggestion that he has broken the peace of our Lord the King, and violated his crown and dignity: but it never enters into any man's head that, by this technical falsehood, he is ever treated as a criminal. Now, the case is, in truth, not wholly dissimilar with our ecclesiastical process. In matrimonial, testamentary, and various other causes, a man is brought before the Bishop's Court, not, indeed, by an express averment, but by a tacit and theoretical presumption, that he is in communion with the national religious establishment. And yet, though he may most heartily wish himself out of the gripe of that jurisdiction, it is very seldom an afflicted conscience that is the cause of his impatience. So little of an exclusively spiritual character\* is supposed to adhere to those Courts at the present day, that the parties brought before them are often scarcely more conscious of being under a spiritual jurisdiction, than a man brought before the King's Bench, in a civil action, is conscious of being under criminal jurisdiction.

But if this be so it may possibly be asked, why is this anomaly tolerated an instant longer? why is a liberal and enlightened age burdened with the machinery of a system adapted in its forms to an ecclesiastical constitution, which recognises no liberty of dissent from the national belief and discipline? And why must the Church thus bear the discredit of adhering to a form of spiritual regimen, while the power of it, as to matters really spiritual, is forgotten or denied? And why, we may ask in return, are not all reforms, of every description, carried on at once to their completion? Why is it that in all projects for the improvement of mankind, the performance often halts so lamely after the design?

\* "Our Ecclesiastical Courts are so taken up with matters of a civil nature, and such as concern temporal property, that spiritual matters, and those which concern the order and government of the Church, are always in danger to be overlooked, and lost in the crowd. Or, if they happen to be regarded, and punished with spiritual censures, yet the same censure being so commonly inflicted in causes of temporal profit, and those oftentimes very trivial, have, by such mean applications, and such frequent and unsolemn use, lost their force and authority in spiritual matters. It cannot be expected that a separation from the communion of the Church should affect the minds of sinners with any degree of terror or remorse, when they see persons of most unblameable lives put into the very same state by the very same hands, upon occasions merely civil and secular, in causes which terminate wholly in temporal profit and have not the least reference to religion and the souls of men."—*Gibson on Visitations; Preface*, p. vii. viii.

Something has been done to remedy the evil here adverted to, by substituting the writ *de contumace capiendo* for process of excommunication, in temporal matters. But this still leaves untouched the objection to the constitution of our Ecclesiastical judicature, as essentially at variance with the principle of toleration.



Why is it that human casualties, and human passions are so often allowed to intercept the blessings which kindly and capacious spirits have meditated for their species? And why is it that the mightiest enterprises of benevolence, and wisdom, and piety, must, after all, be indebted, for their full maturity, to the influence of that greatest of all innovators, Time? Every one, surely, who is familiar with the history of our Reformation, knows that it was left imperfect. To this hour

——— pendent opera interrupta, minæque  
Murorum ingentes.

It is likewise notorious, that many of our most illustrious Churchmen have put up their ardent vows for the completion of the great work: and that to no one object have their prayers, and occasionally their efforts, been more intensely directed, than to a complete revision of our Ecclesiastical laws and discipline. By their voice the Church may be most righteously considered as protesting against the unfinished and ineffective condition of this department of her system. And if, to this moment, her wishes and attempts have been abortive, it must be a most censorious and narrow spirit which could ascribe the failure solely to an inveterate prepossession in favour of abuse. The truth is, that our Ecclesiastical System of Law has, in a long course of ages, become so intricately interwoven with the whole scheme of our Jurisprudence, that human perseverance and sagacity have hitherto shrunk from the task of their separation, lest aggravated confusion, instead of salutary reform, should be the result of their labours.\* And we advert to this consideration, not, most certainly, for the purpose of dissuading all future exertions for the accomplishment of this object, but in order to repel the obloquy, which identifies an attachment to our Established Church, with a stupid fondness for some remaining irregularities of the Structure.

It is a consolatory reflection, in the midst of all the difficulties which involve this subject, that there is nothing in the present constitution of our spiritual judicature which is absolutely *necessary* to the safety of the church, as an integral portion of our social fabric. The whole system, for any thing that we can perceive, might undergo considerable modifications, without dissolving the connection between the Ecclesiastical and the Civil powers. The King might still retain his supremacy as head and representative of the whole Christian community. Every subject in the kingdom might still be regarded as a member of the national church, until he should choose, by some formal and recorded act,

\* "Should an alteration be attempted," says Blackstone, "great confusion would probably arise in overturning long established forms, and new modelling a course of proceedings that has now prevailed for seven centuries."—*Comm.* vol. iii. p. 99.

to abjure her communion, and thus entitle himself to exemption from the purely spiritual and disciplinary jurisdiction of her tribunals. The cognizance too, of those tribunals might, if necessary, be more confined than it now is to cases of a strictly spiritual nature, leaving to the temporal courts the exclusive administration of many secular matters, respecting which they have at present only a concurrent jurisdiction. All this, we conceive, might be done without any fatal dislocation of the present order of things. Whether the benefit to be derived from such a change would be worth the labour and the hazard incident to all innovation, is doubtless a grave and momentous question, which we do not feel ourselves called upon to decide. What we are now contending for is, that, if the experiment were thought advisable, the Church would have no interest in obstructing it. The Church does *not* contemplate her present forms and principles of spiritual judicature as instruments of oppression and intolerance. She does not value them as the means of keeping up a *continual claim* to absolute authority over the conscience of every layman in the realm. In common with every member of the State, she feels that the reform of ancient institutions ought always to be attempted with a reverent and filial caution. But she likewise feels that, if the difficulties of this reform could once be overcome, she might still retain the essence of a national establishment, and might enjoy at the same time, the advantage of a comparatively effective discipline.

This, however, is high matter, and much too various and comprehensive to be effectively discussed in a brief and fugitive essay like this. Our more immediate business is with general principles; and we accordingly return to our Episcopalian, whom we left triumphing in the notion that our Church is at variance with the laws of Christ, because her formularies do not distinctly renounce the right of torturing and burning heretics. And we revert for one moment to this department of his subject, because his treatment of it seems to furnish strong reasons for distrusting the soundness of his judgment and the worth of his speculations. We are not, indeed, quite confident that we fully comprehend his reasonings respecting the application of force in matters of conscience: but, as we understand them, their tendency is to establish thus much—namely, that persecution for religious opinion is to be reprobated—not because it does not answer, or answers only when carried to remorseless extremities, the very thought of which makes humanity sicken—not because it is an instrument which, if allowed at all, may be grasped by error as well as by truth, and be employed by societies of men for their mutual extermination;—but, *solely*, because our Saviour renounced expressly all

secular jurisdiction, authority, and power. We have here a signal instance of the tyranny which an hypothesis is sometimes able to exercise over the understanding. A mind free from any such sinister possession could hardly fail to perceive, that no oracle from heaven could be required to pronounce the reprobation of a system which arrays the terrors of this world against the freedom of the conscience. If Jesus Christ had never uttered one syllable which could be construed into a condemnation of it, the practice would still have remained utterly incapable of vindication. Every *unbiassed* understanding would have revolted against it as a gross absurdity; it being (to use the somewhat homely illustration of Jeremy Taylor) almost as unnatural to guide the opinion by corporeal infliction, as it would be "to cure the colic by brushing a man's clothes, or to fill a man's belly with anthems, or syllogisms, or long orations."\* Our *unperverted* moral sense would have revolted at it, as an insult to the God of all peace and mercy, who never can be well pleased in seeing his own Truth enforced by instruments which extort tears, and shrieks, and groans, or in witnessing our attempts to bring down his Spirit upon earth, not in the form of the gentle dove, but of the ravening vulture.† Needful it cannot be that any one should *ascend into heaven to bring down these truths from above, or descend into the deep, and bring them up to us from below: the Word is nigh unto us, even in our mouths, and in our hearts.*‡ An express revelation from heaven would, doubtless, be requisite to authorize the enforcement of religious uniformity by the secular arm; but no superhuman sanction can be wanted to justify an abstinence from such unnatural modes of discipline.

We cannot wholly dismiss this part of the subject without proclaiming our dissent from certain notions adopted by this writer from Warburton, and applied by him to the illustration of the difference between the Jewish and the Christian Churches. § Jehovah, he contends, being the Supreme Magistrate of Israel, was entitled, not only to their religious adoration, but to their civil allegiance; and it was on this ground, and this only, that, with them, religious offences were visited with secular infliction. Now, with all the respect which is justly due to so great a name as that of Warburton, we must honestly confess that, to us, this view of the subject seems full of obliquity and affectation. There is an air of pedantic technicality about it, wholly unworthy of so solemn a matter. Every one, surely, must feel his conceptions of the intercourse between the Supreme God and his chosen people miserably lowered on being told, that with them the sin of

\* Jeremy Taylor's Lib. Proph.

† Deut. xi. 11—14.

‡ Bacon.

§ Letter 1.

blasphemy was merged in the offence of sedition—idolatry, and the worship of false gods, in that of high treason—the violation of religious ordinances in that of rebellion—and that the service of Baal was, in truth, a transfer of their *civil* allegiance from their own rightful sovereign to a stranger, an offence which is made *capital* by every prudent government. Who can endure the thought, that among the Jews, a blasphemer of the everlasting Jehovah was to be punished by the State, merely on the same principle as that upon which, with us, a man is indicted for a libel upon the king? or, that an Israelite found among the worshippers of Moloch, was to be treated just as we should deal with a traitor, who would be hanged or shot if found fighting in the ranks of the enemy? All this must appear very strange and very trifling to ears accustomed only to the awful and majestic statements of Scripture. It would be far more just and becoming to affirm—not that religious offences, under the theocracy, were lowered into civil ones—but rather, that even civil delinquencies were heightened into religious ones; and that religious delinquencies, as well as civil, were visited with secular penalties, *simply and solely*, because the Almighty had expressly declared that so it should be. This view of the matter disposes of all difficulties in the simplest way; in the way which is most fitting, when the Deity bares his own right arm, and utters his own mighty voice. On the one hand, it tramples down the audacity of those who presume to murmur against the intolerant and unsparing character of the Mosaic system. It repels, on the other hand, the rashness which, on the authority of that system, would invest Christian potentates with such unlimited discretion in religious matters, as could be safely exercised only under the immediate direction and control of heavenly wisdom. And, lastly, it pours contempt on the folly which bewilders itself with interminable speculations upon the mysterious contrast between the hard and severe dispensation of the Law, and the mild and indulgent system of the Gospel. The plain truth of the matter is simply this; abstinence from the penal enforcement of religious uniformity by the secular arm, is the general rule; the use of such enforcement is the exception; and nothing can fully sanction or justify the exception, short of the positive institution of such a principle of government by the Deity himself. Such an exception occurred under the Jewish Theocracy: and until such shall occur again, the temporal sword must never be drawn for the control of conscience. To this result every candid and intelligent reader of the Old and New Testament can hardly fail to arrive; and he may most certainly arrive at it without fetching a compass through the regions of Warburton's fantastic theory respecting the authority of Jehovah as the *first Civil Magistrate* of the commonwealth of Israel.

The fourth and longest of these letters is devoted to a consideration of the alliance between the Church and the State; and we gladly take the opportunity it affords us of declaring, that after the most patient consideration of the subject, we agree decidedly with our author in his condemnation of the theory of Warburton. We wish, however, to have it clearly understood that our dissent from the system of that great writer rests on grounds entirely distinct from those which are occupied by the Episcopalian. The original position taken by both is in fact the same, namely, that the religious and the temporal interests of a people are essentially separate; and that the Religious Society and the Civil Society are in their nature two distinct communities; but, setting out as they do from this common point, they contrive to reach very opposite conclusions.

A full examination of the ingenious hypothesis of Warburton would betray us into much greater prolixity than could be endured in these pages. We shall therefore content ourselves with declaring that our very souls revolt from the representation it gives of the Church and the State, as two independent and sovereign powers, driven by their mutual necessities into a most undignified compact, miscalled an Alliance; an agreement, by virtue of which the Church surrenders her independence in exchange for protection, and the State confers protection in exchange for the advantage of possessing a powerful engine of social order and stability. By this scheme it is virtually maintained, that earthly rulers would be quite at liberty to omit religion altogether in their original scheme of polity, and to dispense with it till the end of time, if the civil and temporal concerns committed to their charge could be preserved from havoc and confusion without its aid. Religion, according to this notion, is introduced into the commonwealth by a sort of after-thought, and not till experience has shown it to be an essential element in the social fabric. It is regarded as a sort of supplementary contrivance, not as a fundamental principle; as a buttress added for the support of a building imperfectly and unskilfully constructed, not as the imperishable rock which is to sustain the edifice, and enable it to defy the tempest and the flood. The gigantic powers of Warburton himself could never give firmness and dignity to a system like this. There is something in it so degrading and injurious to the Church, and so libellous towards the State, that every honest heart must be satisfied of its unsoundness. Even they who may be unable to detect its fallacies by any reasoning process, will yet be prompted almost instinctively to reject it. It is a system which positively afflicts every soul sincerely interested for the glory of God, and thoroughly persuaded of the immortal

destinies of man. It represents the two contracting parties as brought together by a sort of low-minded sordid compromise, instead of being indissolubly united in a holy league for the temporal and eternal welfare of the human species.

But if the hypothesis of Warburton be so exceptionable, how shall we describe that of his present examiner? Warburton, indeed, contends for the original distinctness of the two societies, but then he perceived that it would scarcely be possible for them to continue long separate without the worst consequences; and that, somehow or other, they ought to come together. And though he does not contrive to unite them upon terms very creditable to either, yet the alliance he has patched up between them is a scheme which, in the course of time, might practically work well, especially when the circumstances, in which he supposed the compact to originate, should have been put out of sight and forgotten. But our present reformer is not content with asserting their original independence on each other; he stoutly maintains that they ought to have remained for ever separate: that any coalition whatever between them must be pernicious to both, and more especially fatal to the Church, whose language ought always to be "*Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam.*" He affirms, in short, that religion is an affair with which the civil power has nothing to do but barely to give it protection; that the magistrate is, in his public capacity, to appear totally blind to any difference of value between different modes of faith; and, in short, that the state as such is to be *of no religion at all*. Now, we do solemnly protest that we are unable, without feelings approaching to dismay and abhorrence, to contemplate such a state of society as that which he here recommends as most favourable to the cause of religion. If the principles of this writer are to be admitted, our rulers are not only to abstain from coercion, but to maintain the strictest neutrality between every imaginable variety of faith. They are not only to view with perfect indifference the various forms of Christianity, but to appear utterly unconscious of all religious distinctions whatever. They are not only to refrain from all discouragement of Popery or fanaticism, but they are to know no difference between the Bible, the Koran, and the Veda. As public functionaries, they are not to encourage Christianity, under any shape whatever, by the exercise of their public influence, for this would be a violation of the maxim, that the state is a sort of abstraction, incapable of all religion! And if this were so with us—if the Church were in no sense whatever a part and parcel of the State—if the Christian religion were in no acceptance whatever to be a portion of the law of England,\* what would be our

\* The author asks, what are we to understand by the assertion that Christianity is a



condition?—what security should we have for the principles of the legislature and the government? The civil magistrate, and his whole body of counsellors may be Papists or Protestants—Buddhists or Brahmins: nay—there is nothing to prevent an open and avowed Atheist from mounting the throne. For anything that the constitution would provide to the contrary, the impious tyrants of revolutionary France, or the worshippers of the strumpet-goddess of reason, might be just as lawfully entrusted with the management of our national interests, as our Protestant legislature, and the Protestant princes of the House of Brunswick. If all religious tests whatever be, as this writer seems to think, positive encroachments on the spirituality of the Saviour's dominion, we are quite unable to perceive why every variety of belief, or unbelief, beneath the sun, might not have its representative and its advocate in our houses of parliament. We know not whether the author can contemplate these consequences with serenity; whether he imagines that they can be acceptable to God or man; or whether he will allow such consequences to result from his theory. To us they appear unutterably frightful: and moreover, to result by inevitable inference from his premises. He evidently conceives that the Church and the State ought to be as completely separate and independent at this moment, as they were in those days when Paganism was on the throne, and Christianity *whispered out of the dust*. Whether the civil rulers profess the Gospel or not, there is to be, on that account, no difference in the Church's condition with respect to them. Whether heathens or believers, they have no more right to a voice in any of her concerns, than Nero had a right to meddle with the ecclesiastical discipline and administration of the primitive societies of Christians. The Church, as a body, is to look on the secular commonwealth as a being without religious capacities, and of which a religious character or profession can be no more predicated than temperament, stature, or complexion. And if so, the only legitimate frame of Christian society must be that, which leaves it a matter of indiffe-

part of the law of the land? On the authority of one of the first lawyers now living we will inform him.

The expression was first used by Lord C. J. Hale in passing sentence on one Taylor, upon an information against him, for preaching that religion was a cheat, and uttering very gross and profane language respecting Christianity. 1 Ventris, Rep. 293. From that time it has been acknowledged as a principle, and was acted upon in *Rex v. Woolston*, Strange's Rep. 834, and in *Rex v. Williams*, before Lord Kenyon in 1797; and in many other cases. And the extent of it is understood to be, that any attempt to subvert Christianity, either by writing or preaching blasphemous, contumacious, or scandalous matter against Christianity in general, or against its particular doctrines, or against its proofs, is an offence against the common law, and punishable in the temporal courts.

In other words, the common law regards the community as professing the Christian religion, and therefore does not allow that religion to be treated with mockery and insult.

rence whether the Church is to exist under a government which professes to act on the principles of Christianity, or on those of infidelity or of downright atheism.

To our apprehensions, we repeat, this would be a state of things full of direst augury to the cause of religion; and therefore with all our strength to be deprecated and abominated. Whether circumstances may not occur in which the difficulty of establishing any particular form of religion may be so great, as to virtually absolve the government from the duty of attempting it, we will not confidently undertake to pronounce. But let us for a moment grant that this might be so; let us concede, for instance, that the social fabric in the United States of America grew up under circumstances which compelled the government to stand absolutely neutral, amidst the varieties of religious persuasion which were imported by her subjects from the Old World—and which placed the government under the hard necessity of leaving the commonwealth without any authoritative provision for the preservation and promotion of Christian knowledge—let us concede all this: what use can be made of such concession to the disadvantage of a frame of society which has grown up under other, and (as we contend) much happier auspices? If it is the good pleasure of Providence, in some cases, to deprive his Church of advantages and supports which, in others, he graciously supplies, it is in his power to indemnify her by some gracious but hidden measure of compensation, and to show that with him it is *no restraint to save by many or by few*. But what could be said of us, if we were violently to rend asunder what for ages have been joined together, and to trample on the securities which, from immemorial time, have been gathering round our national Church? What could be said of us, if we were to cry out to our rulers, that we cared not to have their authority any longer engaged on the side of religion—that their apathy or their zeal was to us a matter of no account—that we only desired them from henceforth to meddle no more with sacred matters? If we were to raise this outcry, now that the state and the Church have, as it were, grown into each other's substance, what could be said of us but that we were flying in the very face of Providence—betraying the Church into unknown perils and temptations—and possibly bringing down a curse upon the state? And what should we deserve for such ungrateful precipitation, but to have our candlestick removed from its place, and to be consigned to the glare of some strange and unhallowed fire? From such fearful experiments we shall, by God's help, most assuredly abstain, until we are impelled by reasons much more potent than that which is incessantly iterated by this reformer—



namely, that Jesus Christ was a conqueror and a king of a very different stamp from Sesostris or Alexander !

We are not, indeed, forgetful of the glories which surrounded the Church of Christ in the days of her agony and persecution. Neither do we doubt that if at this day she were driven out from courts and palaces to sojourn in the wilderness, and compelled to exchange the purple and the fine linen for sackcloth and ashes, that the Lord would still *clothe her with the garment of praise*, and, in his own good time, would take away from her *the spirit of heaviness*. We are well assured that He who sent the ravens to Elijah would appoint his agents and ministers for her support. But though we are firmly persuaded that, even if she were in the midst of the furnace, He could preserve her untouched by the fire, we yet know that it would be impious presumption for her to cast herself into the flames.

It is not a little surprising that in framing his system the writer should not have been startled by the circumstance, that Christian communities have so rarely caught the true spirit of our Saviour's maxim;—if that indeed *be* the true spirit which his alchymy has extracted from it. From the days of Constantine to the present hour, the notion seems almost universally to have prevailed, that the Christian religion is a concern from which the secular powers are never at liberty to keep themselves aloof; that it forms one department of their responsibility; and that to neglect it in their scheme of polity, would be to give to their governments an air of absolute impiety. The author will doubtless here be ready to turn upon us with the reply, that there is one illustrious exception to this general and ancient abuse. There is one country, at least, for which the saying of our Lord has not been too hard; where, conformably to his declaration, religion has resisted all the incumbrance of temporal aid, and all the encroachment of civil power and control: and where religion, accordingly, enjoys that most precious of all privileges, the liberty of administering her own interests, without the slightest interference from the magistrate, either in the shape of impediment or help. Now, we protest that nothing can be further from our thoughts than to breathe a syllable of disrespect towards the institutions of our Trans-Atlantic brethren, whether political or religious. We hope, however, that we may be pardoned for once more suggesting, that the present condition of Christianity in North America may rather be considered as the result of imperious circumstances, than of any enlightened views, originally and systematically entertained, relative to the full import of our Saviour's declaration. A religious establishment, in the *Anglican* sense of that word, might, all things

considered, have been next to an impossibility in the United States. And if the present system, or want of system, should in the end be found to succeed; if the various, irregular, and unconnected schemes, actually employed in that country for the preservation of genuine Christianity, should finally prosper, we know not but that this result ought to be ascribed to a gracious Providence, extracting good out of evil, giving to weakness all the triumphs of strength, and working wonders of mercy, rather in spite of the existing state of things, than by its instrumentality. But however this may be, there can be nothing unreasonable or uncharitable in the assertion, that, as yet, we are in no condition to pronounce on the wisdom of this policy. The trial of half a century is by no means sufficient to decide so mighty a question. Ages must elapse before we can be certain whether the Founder of the Church will send down his blessing on this practical interpretation of the saying, that *his kingdom is not of this world*.

To revert, however, to the consideration of our own country. We greatly suspect that the substantial merits of the question respecting our ecclesiastical polity have often been confounded and obscured by the phraseology, by which it has so long been commended to the affections of Englishmen. The very words—Church and State—are apt to present to the mind the notion of two essentially independent communities. When a man is swallowing a bumper to Church and State, or to Church and King—provided he is in a condition to think at all—the probability is, that he thinks of a sort of partnership concern, which, in some way or other, is exceedingly beneficial to the public, and in which the Church is one separate and distinct party, and the King or the State is another; just as the members of a commercial house constitute one firm, and yet may at any time dissolve their connection, and confine themselves each in future to the care of his individual interests. But who can fail to discern, on a moment's reflection, that this is a view of the matter which is utterly erroneous when applied to countries where the religion is nearly co-extensive and identical with the civil community? In heathen states, where Christianity is only tolerated, the commonwealth and the Church may, indeed, be to all intents and purposes distinct. But when the commonwealth professes Christianity, its distinction into two separate societies is naturally at an end; and the terms Church and State then indicate, not two distinct interests, but rather the self-same community under different aspects, and exercising different functions. “When we speak of the commonwealth separately,” says Hooker,\* “we speak of the community with reference to the public affairs thereof, religion excepted; and by

\* B. viii.

the Church we mean the same society, with reference solely to religion. The two words, indeed, import things different: but those things are accidents which may, and always should, dwell lovingly together in one subject." But in the disquisition before us, the appellation of *the Church* seems often tacitly restricted to the clergy alone: and it appears to have been forgotten that the laity enter into the composition of the ecclesiastical body as well as those who exercise the spiritual functions; and that the laity have, accordingly, an unquestionable right to a certain share in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. The real question, therefore, is—not whether the State, as one body, has a right to interfere in the concerns of the Church as another body,—but whether the Christian community *in general* have, or have not encroached unduly on the privileges and functions of the more strictly spiritual portion of it. If it should be found, on examination, that the laity and the clergy have either of them invaded the province of the other, it would of course be needful that their mutual relations should be carefully readjusted, and that each should, in future, be confined to their appropriate department of authority and duty. But this sort of reform would imply nothing like an obligation to take to pieces the constitution, which has so long held together all the interests of the community, both civil and religious. The maxim, that our Saviour's is no worldly kingdom, might, in such case, be very properly produced to warn the clergy against the guilt and danger of secular ambition, and to deter the rest of the society from the introduction of worldly principles into the administration of their Church affairs. But we are quite unable to comprehend with what reason or justice it could be alleged, for the purpose of excluding the laity from all powers of action or deliberation, as a part of the *Christian* community; whether such powers were exercised in their own persons, or in those of their civil governors and representatives.

In order to the attainment of just conceptions respecting the relative conditions of the ecclesiastical and civil authority in our constitution, it may be advisable to have recourse to a conceivable case, out of which a state of things would lawfully and naturally grow, very much resembling that which, at the present day, is exemplified in this country. Let us, then, figure to ourselves a small community or colony of emigrating Christians, taking possession of a vacant territory, and carrying with them the primitive faith and discipline in all its purity, and with it the divine, or at least the Apostolic institution, of episcopal government. In this simple condition of society the whole body of the laity would, of course, retain that share in the management of their religious concerns which would belong to them according to the primitive

constitution of every Christian Church; and so long as the community should continue limited in number, so long, perhaps, they might, without intolerable inconvenience, exercise those rights in person. And in this stage of the society no human being would ever think of complaining of the rights and privileges of the laity as encroachments on those of the spiritual pastors and rulers. Such a state of things, however, for obvious reasons, could not possibly remain long unchanged. The increasing magnitude of the commonwealth would render it absolutely impracticable for the business, either of ecclesiastical or civil administration, to be conducted otherwise than by some of those methods of substitution or representation, which are always resorted to as society advances and becomes more complicated. That which was done by the multitude originally, will, in process of time, for the sake of peace and order, be done by that assembly, or that individual, to whom the authority and the voice of the multitude is transferred. In any civil community whatever, power may lawfully be derived from the whole, either to a part, or to an individual, from a variety of causes, and with incalculable benefit to the general interests; and there is no imaginable reason why this should not be true of the same community, considered in its religious capacity. When, therefore, our colony had expanded into a nation, what should we naturally expect to see?—should we not look for the acts of councils or senates or parliaments, where before we had only the tumultuary proceedings of ignorant and turbulent bodies of men? Should we not expect to find the laity's consent to ecclesiastical measures emanating from deliberative assemblies, instead of coming from assemblies incapable of all deliberation?—should we not expect to see the decisions and the regulations of pastors and of bishops, as to spiritual matters, receive the acceptance and the sanction of the whole body, through the medium of that portion of it to whom the administration of all other interests had been entrusted? And should we, finally, have reason to be surprised, if, in process of time, we found, in some instances, the selection of ministers, and of spiritual governors made, not, as in simpler times, by disorderly meetings of the people, but by some body, to whom that trust had been delegated, or, peradventure, by the executive head of the whole realm? And if this should be so, what should we say to a reformer, who, with uplifted hands and eyes, should deplore the degeneracy of the Church, and complain that it had been reduced to slavery by the State? What should we think of one who could see in the lay members of an infant society only a portion of the Church itself; but should look with dismay on the lay-functionaries of an

advanced and populous community, as powers distinct from the Church, and arrayed against its dignity and independence?

Hitherto we have supposed the community in question to have preserved a perfect uniformity both of faith and discipline, to have remained a stranger to heresy or schism, to have been afflicted with no variance from her creed, or defection from her communion; so that the commonwealth and the church would be, up to this point of time, strictly and personally identical: and in that case the Christian and orthodox legislature or government could never be regarded by the most jealous churchman as looking with an evil or indifferent eye towards the religious interests of the community. Of course it will now be needful to introduce the correction to this pleasing hypothesis, and to imagine that the spirit of dissent has begun to do its work, and to seduce multitudes from their allegiance and duty to their spiritual mother. Let us then accordingly conceive that this inevitable process has actually ended in the production of various and organized societies, separated from communion with the church, either in discipline or in doctrine, or in both; and that the various controversies incident to that course of revolution are nearly at an end; and that, in the fermentation, the spirit of intolerance and coercion has at length been thrown off; and that there remains behind, on the part of the church, little but an honest and hearty zeal for primitive truth, sweetened, however, and tempered by the influences of enlarged charity and improved intelligence:—what will be the state of the church in this altered condition of things? Will she have lost her *essential* union with the general community, in consequence of the revolt of certain of her children? Is it to be endured that the falling-away of some disaffected members should instantly alter her position, disengage her, as it were, from her union with the whole state, exhibit her in the form of an insulated religious association, and reduce her to the same level with the multitudes of sectarian congregations, which have been formed out of the deserters from her pale? Could it be maintained for a moment, that the rise of non-conformity would work a forfeiture of her superior dignity and privilege, degrade her from her post in the constitution, and extinguish her claim to *especial* honour and support at the hand of those powers, who are entrusted with all the various interests of the commonwealth?

Now this hypothetical case furnishes us, we contend, with an apt representation of the present condition of the Church of England—a condition which might have been the lawful result of circumstances such as we have supposed; a condition, therefore, in which, (though it may not have been actually attained by a

process altogether so simple as that which we have imagined above,) she may still rightfully maintain herself. The English Church claims to be no less than a branch of the primitive Episcopal Church of Christ, from time immemorial incorporated with the state; a union which was strengthened at the Reformation, and which subsequent desertions from her communion have not dissolved. In asserting, however, her own supremacy, her charity moults no feather of its wing. She holds, indeed, that hers is *the way* in which it is promised that men shall have access unto God. But then she abstains from harshly judging those who have wandered into other ways. She laments the alienation of those who have deserted her; but whether by their separation they have incurred the guilt of heresy or of schism, she leaves, for the most part, to the judgment of Him who seeth in secret, and shall recompense openly. She claims from the State the distinctions and the privileges which belong to her, as derived from the primitive community of Christians; but she most gladly acquiesces in the amplest provisions which can be required, for securing feeble consciences from violation. And, lastly, she sees in the rulers of the commonwealth, not a band of adverse controllers and inspectors, but rather the brethren of her own communion, engaged with her in promoting the highest interests of mankind.

The above representation of the Church's essential union with the commonwealth, will surely be sufficient to expose the stupid malice which speaks of ours as a religion of mere parliamentary enactment; which chuckles over the idea of men who are Christians as the act directs, and who pray and worship, and seek salvation, according to the statute in such case made and provided: sallies of almost profane merriment, which this author has not scrupled to retail with an appearance of disgraceful satisfaction. If indeed the lay portion of the community, or, in other words, either the legislature or the executive government, were to take upon themselves to frame confessions of faith, and to settle liturgies and offices of worship, and to issue orders for the observance of religious solemnities—and all this, without consulting the spiritual authorities, and acting conformably to their suggestion and guidance—there might be something to provoke the imagination to indulge itself at the expense of our *statutable* piety and *established* devotion. But we cannot believe that any candid and intelligent inquirer can be blind to the true theory of the existing system, as it relates to matters involving the belief and the practice of members of the Church. Such a person could not possibly fail to see, that though, as Hooker remarks, Bishops and Pastors are the fittest persons to draw up creeds, and to prescribe the forms of religious service, and to frame canons for the regulation



of the Church, yet these acts must be accepted by the general body of the Christian commonwealth, and receive their sanction and adoption, before they can be invested with the character of public acts; and how, we ask again, in the present state of society, is that consent to be given, but by those to whom the same general body have delegated all their powers? And, in this country, how is it to be done but through the medium of the legislature or the Crown, which concentrate in themselves the will and authority of the people? One would really imagine, to hear some persons talk, that it was the regular practice in England for country gentlemen, and merchants, and stock-brokers, and bankers, and naval and military officers, to meet together, and to draw up articles of belief, and formularies of devotion, and ecclesiastical rules, solely according to their own good pleasure, and without hearing a syllable upon the subject from bishops, or from divines of any rank or description—without admitting them even to the slightest co-operation—and then to send forth these oracles of religious legislation, as binding upon the conscience or the practice of every human being throughout the realm; and that these enactments could no more be escaped than the provisions of a stamp act or a general inclosure bill! All this while, they who speak thus must surely know, that the spiritual ordinances do in effect always issue from the spiritual rulers, and then are invested with the authority of law by general consent, expressed by the representative body. They must know too, that these acts have generally no operation except on those who remain in communion with the Church, and on those who choose to enter her ministry, and to partake of its privileges and emoluments. Where then can be the pretence for affirming that the consciences of men are enslaved by statutes and proclamations, and that our faith is regulated, as the Roman calendar was, *ex edicto*? In the present state of the constitution, at least, no man in England has his conscience so oppressed, or his faith so regulated; and those who adopt the enacted and parliamentary religion, do so from their own free choice, just as much as they would do if the articles of faith, and the rules of worship came forth, as this writer would have them, upon the sole authority of their clergy. And that the actual operation of this system does not make any frightful havoc with the faith and the devotion of churchmen, seems to be distinctly conceded by the Episcopalian himself, when he allows that our *parliamentary* liturgy and offices far exceed any thing which is to be found in the worship of dissenting congregations!

The supremacy of the King is another abomination which severely discomposes the Episcopalian, and which, in former days, inflicted equal disturbance of spirit upon the champions of the

Holy Discipline,—(who, however, be it always remembered, held that the King was authorized to interfere for the establishment of that very Discipline, and for the suppression of the episcopal ministry; in other words, that he might hold and exercise his headship and supremacy, until *they* were entered who should ease and disburden him of it! \*). But here it may be reasonably asked, if the King is *not* to be head of the Church, who is? Before the abolition of the papal authority in this realm, the Bishop of Rome was, or claimed to be, the head of the English Church, as well as of all other churches. When that yoke was shaken off, the Christian community of England, that is, the English Church, became in all respects independent of foreign jurisdiction and power. To whom, then, could the vacant jurisdiction be so properly transferred as to the chief magistrate of that same community? How could it do otherwise than revert to that depositary with whom it was originally lodged, in Saxon times, before the Romish usurpation had laid waste our independence? The case is simply this: In the plenitude of the pontifical tyranny, our Church was governed by the Pope; it is now governed by *itself*; and the highest functionary in that government is the King. And in this sense it is that the King is the head of the Ecclesiastical Society. The King is the head of the Law, though he is unable to sit in decision upon “a controversy of threepence.” The King is head of the Army, and would be equally so, if the letter of the constitution forbade him to take the field, or to command a battalion. The King is head of the Church, though he is unable to confer the lowest spiritual function on one of his subjects. He is head of the Church, and enjoys the prerogatives attached to that character, as the chief, and in some sort the representative, of the whole body of his Christian subjects. We suspect that in all the discussions on this subject, the very word, supremacy, has exercised that strange influence which mere words are sometimes found to possess; and that it has filled the heads of some well-meaning but shallow thinkers with dismay, at the image of a secular ruler, supreme over the spirits and consciences of all Christian men. Their agitation might surely be composed, by recollecting that the domestic *supremacy* was a title defensively adopted, in order to fill up the void which had been left in the public mind by the destruction of the *foreign* supremacy; and that if the *thing* could have been quietly assumed without insisting so much upon the *name*, we should probably have heard comparatively little of the outcry with which it has been assailed. It should most carefully be kept in mind, that though the King is supreme, as being the

\* Hooker, vol. iii. p. 349, 350. Oxf. ed.



first officer of a people which professes Christianity, he interferes with nothing which is strictly of a spiritual nature; that he is supreme, because he *presides* over a society which is itself sovereign and independent, and mistress of all her own concerns, ecclesiastical as well as civil. And if it should be suggested that the Primate of all England ought to be supreme head of the Church of England, the Primate himself will tell the reformer, that the Church consists of laity as well as clergy; and that the only supremacy which can befit a spiritual person, is the chief eminence among the spiritual orders of the realm.

The next subject of reprobation is the royal prerogative of nominating to bishoprics, a right which naturally results from the Royal Supremacy, and which the Episcopalian condemns as utterly subversive of all notions of a spiritual kingdom; and he does not scruple to aver that the nomination of the King by the bishops would scarcely be more monstrous than the nomination of the bishops by the king. Why, where can this reformer have read ecclesiastical history? He must surely know, that in ancient times, bishops were nominated by the community in general,—*per populum et clerum*? What, then, would he have said had he lived in those times? How would he have been able to reconcile with his notions of a *spiritual* reign, the spectacle of an election of the chief pastors of the church by a tumultuary rabble? Can the imagination picture to itself a fouler violation of the spirituality of Christ's dominion at the present day, than that which would be inflicted by the assimilation of the proceedings in the choice of bishops to those of the county hustings? Is it possible that the author could wish any thing so disastrous for this country as the revival of such practices? If he answers that he would have bishops nominated solely by the clergy, (the Deans and Chapters, for instance, of their respective Cathedrals,) we reply, that he is helping himself to just so much of the primitive practice as may suit his own theory, and rejecting the rest. If the body of the laity are now to be excluded from the *personal* exercise of their original right, with what justice can that right be wholly transferred to the clergy *in person*? What can be more equitable, or more expedient, than that the elective right of the people and the clergy should be made over to the Government, which represents the Christian public, both lay and clerical, and should be exercised by the highest functionary of that government? And what can there be in this arrangement more destructive of the Saviour's spiritual dominion, than in a practice which, had it been preserved, must have been (as for some time it actually was) a constant source of turbulence, confusion, and profligacy?

We may here be permitted to add, without the slightest failure

of respect towards the clerical body, that we are very doubtful whether, as a mere matter of expediency, the appointment of bishops would be necessarily improved by conferring the sole power of nomination on the clergy attached to their Cathedrals. The clergy themselves, we are quite certain, will have the candour to allow, that even clerical societies, however exemplary their individual members, are not always inaccessible to the spirit of party and intrigue. And experience actually comes to our aid in confirming these views. The Colleges of our Universities, though not, strictly speaking, ecclesiastical foundations, have yet a very close connection with the Church; and their Heads, with very few exceptions, must be spiritual persons. And we believe it to be universally felt and acknowledged, that those colleges, whose headships are in the appointment of the crown, are, to say the least, not worse supplied with able and honest presidents, than those where the election to that office rests with the members of the society.

If the Author had contented himself with saying, that for the monarch to confer the spiritual function and character would be as monstrous as for bishops to elect and appoint the monarch, he would have said nothing more than would have been echoed with entire consent by his readers. But can he gravely expect their consent to the assertion, that the nomination of bishops by the crown virtually, though not in form, amounts to this prodigy of usurpation? And will it be believed, that he endeavours to support this position by the following most felicitous argument?—"If a patron could compel the bishop to ordain the person he wished to present, this would be a virtual ordination of the priest. So, because the king can compel the dean and chapter to elect a bishop he may be said to ordain him."—p. 115. Now, is it possible that this writer could have persuaded himself that there exists the slightest similarity between these two cases? Must he not have seen and felt the difference at the very moment he was penning the comparison? The bishop elect is a presbyter already. He has, once for all, been set apart for the service of the altar. The spiritual character has been indelibly conferred on him, solely by clerical authority and ministration; for, neither king, nor parliament, nor any other human power, can ordain, or lawfully compel the ordination of a deacon or a presbyter. All therefore—(must we repeat it once more?)—all which is done by the king is nothing more than that which was originally done by the Christian community. He fixes on the presbyter, on whom the higher spiritual office and dignity is to be conferred; and the consecrated bishop, be it remembered, is a presbyter still; that is, he does not lose that character by his promotion to a higher :

"*in Episcopo*," says Jerom, "*Presbyter continetur*." But what would be the case, if the patron could compel the bishop to ordain? Is it not obvious, that then a layman might dictate, not who should be advanced to a higher function in the Church, but upon whom the bishop should originally lay his hands, in order to his being set apart for the preaching of God's word, and for the administration of his Sacraments?

Another grievous violation of the Saviour's spiritual dominion is that which thrusts upon the prelates the secular duty of legislation, and the worldly rank and title of peers of parliament. Of all the groans extorted by the enormities of our Church, this certainly has, to our ears, the deepest intonation of dogged and sullen opposition. It seems to indicate a resolution to discover that whatever is wrong. That learned, thoughtful, and reverend men, invested with high spiritual office, should sit among the counsellors of their sovereign, appears to carry on the face of it nothing fatally repugnant even to the heavenly character of the Christian dispensation; nothing that an Apostle would condemn if he were to revisit the earth, for the purification of the Church. The Author himself seems to allow that there is nothing in the spiritual function itself to disqualify a man for a seat in deliberative assemblies, whose labours are directed to the most solemn interests of our species; and he would, accordingly, have no objection to an occasional and accidental conjunction of the ecclesiastical office with the temporal dignity: but he cannot endure the constant and regular combination of the two. And yet, if it be once allowed that there is nothing in the episcopal function which unfits a person for a place in the great council of the realm, surely it must require a most microscopic eye for abuse to discover any desecration of that office in the present practice of the constitution,—that, namely, which calls the prelates to the House of Peers, at the same time that it confers the spiritual dignity.

We by no means feel it necessary to enter into a discussion of the technical reason usually assigned for this practice, viz. that the bishops are lords of parliament, merely by virtue of the baronies which they hold, or are supposed to hold, of the crown. We, however, most peremptorily deny the Author's assertion, that this is nothing better than a quibble. It may, at least, be relied on, to show that the dignity of a peer has not, in the theory of our constitution, any necessary or indissoluble connection with the dignity of a bishop. If the Conqueror had suffered a certain number of the bishops to retain their lands on the ancient tenure of frankalmoigne, instead of imposing upon all, the tenure of feudal baronies, we might at this day have seen a part only of our

prelates sitting as lords of parliament, and the remainder excluded from that privilege; just as, in ancient times, there was a limited number of abbots and of priors who had seats in the house of peers, while the rest were left without any right whatever to that distinction. The case of the Bishop of Sodor and Man might be produced as an example *almost* in point. By courtesy he enjoys a seat within the place of meeting of that assembly; but it is merely as an auditor, and without the privilege of deliberation or vote.

It is exceedingly well worth remark, that the Author distinctly allows that clergymen may, without any invasion of their spiritual character, vote *for* members of Parliament; and thus, without seeming at all conscious of it, he causes the charge of quibbling to recoil upon himself: for if the rector may exercise the temporal right of voting at the hustings, by virtue of his freehold, why may not the bishop exercise the temporal right of voting in parliament, by virtue of his barony? If it should still be insisted that the bishop in reality votes in parliament *purely as a spiritual person*, it may also be insisted that the incumbent votes for representatives *as a spiritual person* likewise; for the freehold is quite as intimately connected with the spiritual office of the one, as the barony is with the spiritual office of the other. The objection, therefore, will be equally strong, or equally weak, in either case. In either case, too, the anomaly, if any, is equally glaring. The only difference is, that the spiritual lord acts in person, the spiritual commoner by his representative, each in his respective house of assembly. From the beginning to the end of it, the whole is a miserable cavil: and after this, we must object, by peremptory challenge, to having the Episcopalian, or any who resemble him, put into a commission for considering of a reform in the Anglican Church. If, indeed, he remains true to his own principles, there is but little danger of his ever being tempted seriously to engage in so desperate an undertaking: for he contends that our bishops are *virtually ordained* by our king, and that it is no better than sophistry to say that they are not. And, if this be so, it would seem that our episcopacy is radically vitiated, and our ecclesiastical system reduced to a mere nullity; so that a whole Humane Society of reformers might work upon it for ever, without bringing back to it one particle of the breath of life.

And now—must we go on with the detail of this examination? Must we drag our readers through the whole circuit of this writer's extravagancies? Will it not be better to tell the public at once to look into his system for themselves; but to do so with the following cautions constantly in their recollection:—First,

that he begins from that *πρωτον ψευδος* which we are weary of exposing, namely, that because our Saviour did not come to fight his way to an earthly throne, therefore the king, or the parliament, have no more to do with the Church than they have with the celestial hierarchies. Secondly, that in speaking of the Church he generally seems to think only of the clergy, and to be ignorant or forgetful that the laity also form a part of the ecclesiastical society; and, accordingly, that in maintaining the entire independence of the Church he must be understood to assert, in defiance of all history, that ecclesiastical affairs are the sole province of the clerical body, and that the lay members of the Christian community are destitute of all right to meddle with them. Thirdly, that he absolutely revels and wantons in that most commodious, popular, and tempting of all sophisms, the fallacy of objections! He collects together every imaginable abuse; every conceivable anomaly connected with our ecclesiastical polity; every instance of undue assumption or encroachment on the part of the secular powers; all these he produces with every term of contumely and aggravation; and, under this fire of sarcasm and invective, he marches very comfortably towards his conclusion. We are fully persuaded that no institution, no form of government, no frame of society on earth, could stand for a moment, if the legitimacy of this mode of attack were once to be allowed. Every one knows the brilliant ingenuity with which the abuse of the argument from objections has been exposed by Burke in his celebrated *Vindication of Natural Society*; and if a friend of the Church were to write with a similar design, it would be scarcely possible for him to improve upon our Author's choice of topics, and selection of materials. With some modification, his exposure of the evils and abuses of the existing system might pass for a respectable imitation of Burke's incomparable irony. It might, in like manner, be called "*A Vindication of Religious Independence: or a view of the mischiefs arising from a connection between Church and State*:" and most assuredly, like the performance of Burke, it might be produced as an effective *reductio ad absurdum* of the principles which it affected to support.

Fortunately, the defenders of the establishment have their battery of antagonist objections in readiness. Of these there is one which we have already produced, and which alone might be sufficient to demolish the scheme of the Episcopalian, namely, that this scheme tends to impress upon all governments the features of impiety. If his reform were fully accomplished it would exhibit the detestable spectacle of a Christian country utterly indifferent, in their political capacity, to God's revelation.

Another fearful effect of the separation here recommended,

would be the probable ruin of the existing apparatus for the diffusion and preservation of religious knowledge and principle throughout the land. If the views of the author were carried into execution, the government and the legislature would have no more concern in providing Episcopalian places of worship, or in assisting to guard them from dilapidation, than they now have in keeping the chapels and the tabernacles of nonconformity in repair. The secular arm, in short, must never, on any account, be put forth in support of what is now called the Establishment; all religious bodies must alike be abandoned to their own resources; and our ancient and parental Church left, among the rest, to perpetuate her sanctuaries, as she best might, by an unaided struggle against the caprice, the selfishness, and the apathy of squires and farmers and shopkeepers and mechanics. The almost inevitable consequence of this loss of power would be, that our parish churches would gradually fall into decay; till at last, in the course of a few generations, "Christian cultivation would be found only in rare and occasional spots over the face of extended territories; and instead of the uniform distribution of the word and ordinances, which it is the tendency of an establishment to secure, there would be dreary unprovided blanks, where no regular supply of instruction was to be had, and where there was no desire after it on the part of an untaught and neglected population."\*

In order to obtain a distinct view of certain other blessed results, for which we should have to thank the projects of our reformer, let us imagine that the separation he recommends is safely and successfully completed: that the Church and the State are actually torn asunder, and that the laceration and bleeding consequent upon the process are happily remedied. What should we then have before our eyes but a corporation *collectively* powerful and wealthy, the influence of which is widely diffused throughout the land, and yet forming an interest totally distinct from that of the commonwealth? We say a wealthy corporation;† for be it remembered the author professes no design to sacrifice the property acquired by the Church. On the contrary, his vindication of her endowments is masterly and irresistible. And if such endowments were all that entered into the notion of an *establishment*, establishments, he assures us, would have no adversary in him. Here, then, would be an association, from whose influence no corner of the realm would be free, and with which the government would yet have no more connection than it has with

\* Chalmers's *Christian and Civil Economy of large Towns*, vol. i. p. 91.

† We call the Church wealthy purely with reference to the aggregate of her resources. But if those funds be considered with reference to the whole number of her ministers, she would be found to be in a state of almost primitive poverty.



the Linnaean Society, or with the Agricultural Society, or with the fraternity of Freemasons—a body with which the state would have no other concern than to protect it from insult or aggression, and to take the best care they could that its proceedings kept clear of faction or sedition. Under these circumstances one of two things would inevitably take place. Either the Church would remain *as a city that is compact together*, and would preserve itself in concord and uniformity: or, being relieved from the pressure of all external controul, it would split into factions and divisions till it had lost all character of unity. In the one case we should have to encounter the danger, or at least the trouble and confusion, incident to an *imperium in imperio*; in the other we should be condemned to witness the gradual destruction of the Church's dignity and usefulness.

In the former of these events we should probably soon have to learn, by bitter experience, that the supremacy of the legislature is the only condition on which a large and extended religious society can be endowed and established by any prudent commonwealth; a truth most amply illustrated by the early history of Presbyterianism in Scotland, which exhibits a fearful picture of the conflict which may follow when the ecclesiastical affects a total independence of the civil authority;—a truth which has long been awfully confirmed by the present condition of Ireland, where a vast religious society exists in total exemption from the controul of the legislature or the crown. We have here a proof of the utter insanity of those views which would *recommend* to us an abandonment of all preventive controul over any large, and almost national religious body, that has a strong principle of unity within itself. The danger may, indeed, be fearfully aggravated by the acknowledgment of a foreign supremacy. But still the claim of entire self-management, and of perfect immunity from restraint, on the part of such a society, might alone be sufficient to disturb the quiet and security of any government on earth. And if so, what words can adequately stigmatize the folly of maintaining—as this author in effect maintains—that, because the King or the State are not at the head of the Antiquarian Society, or the Club of Odd Fellows, therefore it is safe for them to renounce their supremacy over a compact and well-organised body, which has perhaps upwards of two millions of revenue,—which is spread over the face of the land,—and whose professional members alone amount to twelve or fifteen thousand persons!

But if, on the contrary, it should happen that a spirit of disunion should get possession of this *emancipated* community—if, on missing the *high pressure* to which it was before exposed, the elastic vapour of religious enthusiasm should burst through all feebler restraints, and scatter its “concealing continent” into

fragments—who can think without anguish and dismay on the consequences that would ensue? Who can reflect without bitterness of soul on the scene of anarchy and confusion and weakness that would soon follow such a crisis? Who could look unmoved on the dissolution of that harmony which now pervades the Church, on the probable loss of all uniformity in faith and discipline, and on the erection of every diocese, perhaps of almost every parish, into the seat of some new variety of regimen or doctrine? Who, in short, can fail to deprecate, with heart and voice, the operation *within* the bosom of the Church of all these causes, which are at this moment producing such a succession of fantastic changes throughout the regions of Nonconformity?

We are entirely persuaded that the venerable body of the English clergy will liberally and candidly admit the justness of these apprehensions. They will clearly perceive that their total separation from the rest of the community must inevitably expose them to the temptation and the peril we have here described; and that so long as human nature remains unchanged, such independence or emancipation as the Episcopalian would offer, would be the most pernicious of all gifts that could be conferred upon their body—ἐχθρῶν ἀδωρεά δωρεά—fatal as the boon of disguised and perfidious enmity.

We are further satisfied that they will forgive us for suggesting, on the other hand, that something valuable is to be learned even from the unfriendly admonitions of the Episcopalian. That man is but a very dangerous advocate of our Establishment who is prepared to maintain that all attempts at reparation and improvement must inevitably end in its ruin. We cannot persuade ourselves that the fabric is so crazy and ill-constructed, that its stability must be endangered by the process of removing, here and there, a portion of its masonry, for the sake of examining the progress of decay, or of introducing sounder materials, or better workmanship. It is absolutely libellous to our constitution, either in Church or State, to tremble at the very name of innovation; as if the structure must necessarily fall to pieces at the first touch of reform. We firmly believe that

“Our castle’s strength would laugh a *siege* to scorn.”

And being prepared to look without dismay even upon the artillery of the foe, we are not to be discomposed by the appearance of the architect and the artificer. With these feelings of perfect reliance on the solidity of the fortress, we have attended the Episcopalian throughout his survey. We have returned from the examination with undiminished courage; but, at the same time, with a deep conviction that much might still be done for the beauty,



the grandeur, and the strength of the edifice, without the slightest hazard either to its foundation, or to any essential portion of its superstructure. Under this persuasion it is that we have ventured almost to invite the spirit of improvement to exercise itself upon our system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which at present does perhaps exhibit too great a mixture of profane and sacred things, and thus practically abandons, in a great degree, the character of a purely spiritual judicature. With the same intrepidity, and with an entire freedom from apprehension for the results, we now call upon our rulers, ecclesiastical and civil, to look boldly in the face of certain other exceptions to the existing state of things, which, though produced by this author in a tone of most injurious exaggeration, are yet, in truth, of magnitude sufficient to claim the notice of all who really love and venerate the Establishment. It is not to be questioned that the clergy are burdened with certain trammels and restrictions which would seem to indicate an ungracious jealousy on the part of the temporal authorities—that services are sometimes exacted from them which are calculated to encroach on their spiritual engagements, and in some measure desecrate their spiritual character\*—in short, that the laity have, in certain respects, “taken too much upon themselves,” and have occasionally approached, with too little reverence, that region of responsibility, which should be trodden by none but consecrated footsteps. We are very far from believing that these encroachments have often been prompted by anything worse than that passion for legislating, which is the constitutional malady of representative governments, and which, in its restless impatience to be doing and managing, spares neither secular nor holy things. It is perpetually spinning its web, and enveloping functionaries of every sort and of every size in the intricacies of its entangling designs. The Established Church, of course, could hardly expect exemption from the manipulations of this busy and importunate spirit; and she has accordingly experienced them till she has at times been almost ready to fancy herself reserved for a species of novel and puny persecution, which inflicts molestation, but not martyrdom. Whether she has, as this author affirms, acquiesced too easily in these exactions, and has failed to lift up the voice of an emphatic protestation against them, it is now of little importance to inquire. To us this representation of the matter appears decidedly invidious and exaggerated, if not altogether unfounded. But however that may be, a time is now come in which she may safely manifest her confidence in her own resources; proclaim that she has nothing to fear from any experiment (conducted in a

\* The evil of these secular interruptions is stated with admirable vigour and deep feeling by Dr. Chalmers, *Christian and Civil Economy*, &c. vol. i. p. 31—40.

spirit of friendship and honesty) for completing whatever her reformers may have been compelled to leave unfinished. She has prelates upon her bench eminent for learning, and zealous for every good work; she has a clergy, perhaps beyond the example of all former times, intelligent, active, and exemplary; and she is, we are persuaded, still strong in the confidence and the affections of the people. She is therefore in a state to hail, and to welcome, every indication of a wish to give her powers their full effect upon the piety, the virtue, and the happiness of the empire.

We must abstain from any attempt to enter upon an examination of the various projects which may have been occasionally put forth, for a modification either in the offices, discipline, and jurisdiction of the Church, or in the state of her relations with the rest of the commonwealth: and we have placed at the head of this article the titles of two small works relating to such matters, not with any view of discussing all the questions they embrace, but rather for the purpose of indicating, that these two pilot-balloons have been sent up, apparently, to ascertain the current of public feeling and opinion relative to this subject. There are, however, one or two points which seem irresistibly to demand immediate notice. Is it then fitting, we would ask, in the first place, that the Rubric of the Church should enjoin the minister to refuse the sacrament to notorious evil livers, and yet should expose him to ruinous vexation if, according to the best of his conscience and belief, he should venture to comply with that injunction? Is it not a burning disgrace to our Ecclesiastical History, that the apostolic Bishop Wilson, of Sodor and Man, should have been almost reduced to poverty by the litigation in which he was involved by his conscientious discharge of this duty? And can it be too deeply lamented that the Church is thus effectually deprived of an instrument of discipline which was so powerful in the earlier ages; and which is still possessed, in its full vigour, by every dissenting community in the kingdom? In the second place, is it possible to reflect, without sorrow and indignation, on the present mutilated condition of episcopal authority? If any crying scandal occurs in the Church—if a Deacon or a Presbyter disgrace his sacred calling by personal dissoluteness, and thus make the service of the Lord to be abhorred—the clamour instantly arises—Where is the bishop? Is he slumbering upon his cushion of purple velvet? What can be the use of prelates if they suffer such abominations to pass with impunity? The bishop all this while, instead of reposing upon his cushion, is probably vexing his righteous soul with the thought that the constitution deprives him of all power of summary and effective interference; that it esteems the temporal

rights of the clergyman as far more precious than the spiritual welfare of the people committed to his charge; and places in the way of retribution the gorgon-head of a terrific law-suit. And if, on the other hand, any one should propose to remedy this shameful defect, and to strengthen the hands of the spiritual censor, we are forthwith assailed with a loud and full chorus of deprecation, against the iniquity of surrendering the property and character of individuals to the discretion of arbitrary churchmen. If any thing could convert us to the views of the Episcopalian, it would be this vexatious denial of common justice to the cause of religion: and we gladly seize this opportunity of proclaiming our conviction, that more would be done for the honour, the efficacy, and the real sanctity of the Establishment, by the application of a remedy to this enormous evil, than by almost any measure of reform that could be imagined. As for the danger of depositing too large a share of discretionary power in the hands of individuals, there is one obvious answer to all such objections: discretionary power must, in many cases, be lodged somewhere; and, in this case, the best possible security against its abuse, would be a deep sense of responsibility on the part of those, who are entrusted with the choice of the highest functionaries of the Church.

But we very plainly foresee, that our readers will be heartily sick both of Church and State, if we detain them much longer with our speculations; and as we have no sort of intention to excite disaffection against either, we shall speedily draw our meditations to a close. Sundry things we shall leave unsaid, which we had intended to say; and, perhaps, we shall give to the Episcopalian the triumph of some unanswered objections which we have omitted to notice, partly that we might not abuse the patience of the public; partly, because we are fully persuaded that the view we have given of his main principle and argument will be amply sufficient to enable any attentive reader to demolish the remainder of the system for himself. Before, however, we finally retire from the subject, we must beg permission to revert, for one moment, to the precise position occupied at this day by our Established Church; and to offer one or two observations respecting her rights, which strike us as not wholly irrelevant or unimportant.

The Church of England then claims to be a branch of the true primitive Apostolic Church, and, as such, holds herself to be rightfully and immemorially entitled to the spiritual allegiance of the people of this realm. Whether this claim be well or ill-founded, is of course a separate question: but (without undertaking to pronounce on the condition or the fate of those who have withdrawn their allegiance from her,) this we conceive to be *the* claim which she must be understood at all times to prefer on her own behalf:

and if so, she clearly cannot recognise in her princes and rulers any right to remain neutral respecting her, and to regard her merely as one out of a multitude of Christian associations. Still less can she be expected to join the Episcopalian in calling upon *the powers that be* to profess and act upon this principle of absolute neutrality. In her estimate, such a principle is hardly to be reconciled with the character and the duty of nursing fathers to the Church. But here we are sure to be encountered by a difficulty. What, it may be asked, is to be done, supposing the defection from the Establishment should become much more widely diffused than it ever yet has been, and should be so far extended as to be almost universal? Is the state to continue, in spite of such defection, her special countenance and support to the Anglican Church, and to maintain her in her present elevation above all other religious communities? Are kings to remain the nursing fathers of a Church which appears to be passing away, while they still maintain an aspect of neutrality towards every other form and denomination of Christianity?

Now we scruple not to avow that *we are not careful to answer in this matter*. As Churchmen we are not bound to answer it. We are no more bound to answer this, than the heads of a legitimate government are bound to answer in a case not *wholly* dissimilar. No government can be called upon to declare and to define, precisely under what particular combination of circumstances, resistance to their power ceases to be identified with opposition to the will of God. It is His express declaration that *whoso resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God; and that they who resist shall receive to themselves condemnation*: and we hold it not expedient or pious that human legislatures should presume, by express enactment, to make exceptions from that general and sovereign command. But yet, on the other hand, no one, who is not enamoured of obsolete prejudices, ever thinks of denying, at the present day, that extremities may arise which shall convert allegiance to the monarch into treason against human nature. And if an emergency so calamitous should come upon any people, that emergency would itself unquestionably be regarded—not as a repeal of the general law of non-resistance—but as a practical suspension of it in a case of overpowering emergency;—a dispensation as plain as if it were written legibly in the skies, or pronounced audibly by a voice from heaven. And if it be said that an entrance is hereby ministered abundantly to the spirit of anarchy and revolution, our reply must be, that this cannot be helped; that men must judge and act in such cases at their peril; that it is a part of their moral probation; and woe be to them who *use that liberty as a cloak of maliciousness*, instead

of remembering that, under all trials and vicissitudes, they are *the servants of God*. We consider the merits of the question respecting the duty of the government towards our established religion to be, *in some respects*, analogous to this. We, who are members of the Church, conceive it to be the duty of the civil magistrate to uphold the Church; to cherish and support her, and to give her an honourable, though not a despotic, supremacy above other persuasions; to treat her, not as one of many sects, but as the venerable parent from whom numbers of her children have unhappily, and in some instances most undutifully and wilfully, seceded. We ask for no persecution of the deserters and recusants; neither are we provoked to malevolence or jealousy by the thought, that the divine goodness *may* open the gates of mercy much wider than seems clearly promised in the written word, and may ultimately admit them all to sit down with her in the kingdom of heaven. But yet we do confidently demand for her more abundant honour, and more distinguished protection and support, than is granted to Christian societies of different discipline and constitution, because we believe her to be descended from the ancient and primitive communion, and derived by unquestionable succession from the apostolic age. And if it should be asked, what is the State to do, if the revolt from her should become nearly general? Must her establishment and her supremacy still be continued, notwithstanding those in communion with her should dwindle down into a mere remnant of the *whole Empire*? Must almost the whole population still wear the badge of non-conformity, for not adhering to a society which appears, by almost universal consent, to be abandoned? If this question should be asked, we reply, once more, that we are not bound to answer it; or, at least, that we are bound to answer it only by allowing that a period of such overruling exigency *may* possibly arrive, as shall bear down all ordinary rules and principles of duty. The tide of circumstances *may* be overwhelming. The current of necessity *may* be irresistible. The ruling powers *may* be absolutely compelled to abandon the episcopal and primitive establishment; but if they should be so compelled, it would be, not because it had ceased to be their duty to uphold it, but because emergencies have rendered the performance of that duty an absolute impossibility. The obligation would not be abolished, but *for the time* dispensed with; and the difficulties of the period might, of themselves, be considered as forming that dispensation. But we are not under compulsion to state beforehand, on the requisition of every dealer in systems and theories, what is the exact point up to which the civil government might be expected to persevere in its adhesion

to the Established Church, and what are the exact circumstances which would justify a capitulation to her adversaries. Of the governor of a fortress it may be said, in general terms, that he must defend his charge to the last: of the commander of a ship, that he must never strike while there is the faintest hope of victory: of the Head of our Church, that he must never abandon her unless a season should come, which would seem almost to indicate that she had been deserted by heaven itself. In no one of these cases can the extremity be defined which is to terminate the resistance of the party who bears the responsibility of defence. The crisis, when it comes, must provide for itself. To provide for it previously to its arrival, would only be to plant snares in the path of the Christian magistrate, and perhaps to invite the dæmon of revolution to rush in, where angels should almost fear to tread.

By way of further exposition of our views, we may state, that conformably to those views, we conceive it to be the duty of our government to uphold and to establish the Anglican Church in all the dependencies of Britain. But then we hold that there may be situations and predicaments which present insurmountable difficulties to the execution of that duty, and which, so long as they continue, virtually absolve the state from the guilt of a breach of it. But this is very different from the concession, that in such cases, the civil power is to assume an aspect of perfect indifference to every variety of discipline or persuasion. In India, for instance, considered as a dependency of the British empire, we conceive (speaking as churchmen) that it is the duty of the British government there, to labour for the establishment, not only of Christianity, but of the Anglican doctrine and regimen throughout those vast regions. But though this may be true as an abstract proposition, we scruple not to allow that this obligation is virtually suspended and postponed by the present condition of society in Hindostan. The attempt to make Christianity, in any form, at once the national and established religion of that country, and to treat the natives as if they were dissenters from it, would most probably be attended with nothing but havoc and confusion. The project, in the existing state of things, would be chargeable with downright insanity. The government is therefore compelled by overpowering impediments to assume, in some respects, an appearance of neutrality as to religion, which nothing but irresistible necessity could fully justify. If, however, circumstances should ever occur to place it within their power not only to spread the Gospel throughout India, but with it completely to establish the English Church, and to make it supersede every other mode of faith, worship, and discipline; we of the Church hold clearly, that they would be without excuse, should they neglect such opportu-



nity, *provided always* that the object could be attained without any forcible invasion of the rights of conscience. We cannot imagine that in such case it could be competent to them to continue neutral. The establishment of an episcopal Christian Church, we contend to be one of the objects which a Christian government should constantly keep in view, to be accomplished either immediately or remotely, as circumstances may prescribe.

We are, of course, distinctly aware of the endless perplexity introduced into discussions of this nature, by the objection, that if rulers are to protect and establish any particular mode of faith and worship in their dominions, they are at least as likely to lavish their care upon a wrong belief and discipline as a right one; that truth is one, and error infinitely multiform; and that it seems monstrous that the spiritual persuasion or profession of multitudes, should at all depend upon the caprice or the conscience of an individual, or of a small body of fallible men. Without attempting to dissipate all the confusion which hangs over this subject, we have only to remark, that the choice of religion, whether by individuals or public bodies, is, from the very nature of the case, a matter liable to uncertainty, and sometimes appears to be determined nearly as much by circumstances as by anything else. That this should ever be the case, is among the hidden things of God. It is a mystery the knowledge of which is too hard and deep for us; *we never can attain unto it*. But this difficulty can never leave it doubtful for a moment, whether it is the duty of men to seek and to maintain the truth. It never will be denied, that man is, generally speaking, under an obligation to embrace the true religion. But then it may be asked, how is he to know which is the true religion, while the world is distracted between varieties of belief which oppress the memory and baffle enumeration? To this the only answer is, that he must do the best which circumstances render possible; and it must be left to Almighty God to judge how far his failure is to be ascribed to the peculiarity of his condition,—how far to the abuse of his opportunities, and the neglect of his talents. In the same manner, if it be inquired, how is a ruler or a legislator to fix upon the faith which is most worthy of establishment or patronage, while the chances are so fearfully great against the justness of his choice? We must again resort to our former reply. He must spare no pains to make a right decision, and must leave the event to Him who judgeth righteously, and who alone can see whether the best use has been made of the facilities afforded him, or the most strenuous exertions put forth in opposition to the impediments he has had to encounter. The difficulty of deciding rightly may be formidably great—the difficulty of carrying his determinations, when formed, safely into



execution, may perhaps be still greater. But yet, in spite of these considerations, one thing we do contend for, with all our heart, and with all our mind, and with all our souls, and with all our strength—namely—that to *set out* upon our speculations from the assumption, that civil rulers are, *as such*, absolved from all care or responsibility on the subject of religion—is a most prodigious abomination! It may, indeed, be hard to determine what course is *right*; but to us it appears absolutely certain that *this* principle is *wrong*. It cannot find favour with God, and therefore ought not to find favour with man. We do therefore hope and trust, that in spite of the lectures of the Episcopalian, it never will be endured, for a moment, by our rulers, ecclesiastical or civil.

One word, before we conclude, upon the temper which seems to pervade these letters. To this we have already adverted incidentally in the course of our remarks; and we rise from our task with a decided impression, that the work is conceived and executed in an unfriendly and contemptuous spirit, and that, at times, it betrays a savour as rank and coarse as that of downright sectarian virulence. That the author is a person of considerable vigour and acuteness, it would be absurd to question; but then he appears to us to labour under a deficiency of mental rectitude; to be liable to that sort of intellectual obliquity which is usually known by the name of wrongheadedness, and which is sometimes found in combination with considerable powers of understanding. This peculiarity we hold to be signally exemplified by his main position and argument. He seems to have got it into his head that there is something of magical potency in the words, *my kingdom is not of this world*; that they have the operation of a sort of spell; that we have but to pronounce them, and the wall opens,\* and the chambers of imagery are disclosed, and the light is let in upon the ancients of our Israel, and discovers them, every man with his censor in his hand, debasing themselves even unto hell, before all manner of abominations; and thus provoking the fury of the Lord, so that his eye should not pity, nor his hand spare, nor his ears be open to the cry of their Church! In reprobating what he is pleased to term the degradation of that Church, he represents her as openly glorying in her abasement; and he absolutely “tires himself with base comparisons,” in his eagerness to expose her shame to the world. At one time he likens her to the mischievous dog who was condemned to wear a wooden clog, and yet was proud and silly enough to mistake its burden for a badge of honourable distinction. At another time he compares her to the sleek and well-fed mastiff with the mark of servitude

\* Ezek. viii.

round his neck. Judas and his thirty pieces of silver are produced to illustrate the turpitude of her mercenary spirit; and her cruel humiliation is portrayed by the mockery of the scarlet robe, and the reed for a sceptre, and the taunting salutations of the Jewish rabble. Her clergy are compared to the soldiers of ancient Persia, who were brought into the field by the lash; and the profanation she suffers from her connection with the state is stigmatized as worse than the sacrilege committed by the impious Belshazzar, when he dared to grace the revels of idolatry with the holy vessels of the Temple of Jehovah! Not a single restraint is imposed upon her by the lay authorities—not a single service is exacted of her, at all at variance with the sacredness of her functions—but (if we are to believe him) she has herself to thank for it, and herself only. She has acquiesced in humiliation, till it has become her daily bread; and unless she starts up, and demands her release from the Pharaoh who oppresses her, she deserves to forfeit the protection of the Lord, and to eat the wretched meals of slavery for ever! One would imagine that a Church in such a condition as this must be ripe for destruction, if indeed it had not already lost the character of a Church. The author, it is true, has been most benevolently pleased to protest, that by these censures he has no intention wholly to disfranchise and *unchurch* us; and for the relief afforded by this gracious declaration, we trust we are duly thankful! But yet we must confess that, when we look back upon the tenor of his disquisition, our misgivings and alarms return upon us with unabated violence. We find it difficult to reconcile the lenity of his final sentence with the course of his argument, and the severity of his strictures and reproaches. If there be any truth and soundness in his principles, the spirit of our Saviour's dispensation has been *fatally* violated by our ecclesiastical polity. Our Church has been converted from a spiritual institution into a worldly kingdom; and the succession of her chief pastors has been interrupted, or at least rendered highly doubtful, by the profane intrusion of the royal hand: and, in that case, every attempt at mere reform could be little better than nugatory; and we should be reduced to the necessity of transfusing into our ecclesiastical body, the principle of life, from the veins of some purer and more healthy communion! In short, we cannot persuade ourselves that we have before us the work of one who has *smitten us in kindness*. His reproofs, most certainly, have no sort of resemblance to an *excellent and balmy oil which breaketh not the head*.\* On the contrary, we have sometimes, in the course of our examination, been almost irresistibly possessed with the fancy, that we could plainly

\* Ps. cxli. 5.

recognize the "sweet *Roman hand*" of Dr. Doyle, in parts of his composition; and we have been positively obliged to pause in our perusal, and to make repeated and vigorous efforts to shake off our suspicions!

For ourselves, however, we can declare, that these injurious assaults have not had the effect of lowering one jot the tone of our confidence in the *substantial* soundness and excellence of our present system of Ecclesiastical polity; respecting which we are still prepared to exclaim, with unimpaired attachment and veneration, *esto perpetua!* Of reform in the Church, we are, indeed, perfectly willing to hear; but then it must be on the condition that it involves no approach to that unblest and ruinous temerity, which would rend asunder our Constitution in Church and State, and untwist the golden cord which has, for ages, supported all the most precious interests of our country. The sum of the whole matter, we honestly believe, may be fairly stated in two words. The Church of England stands, at this hour, upon a glorious eminence; surrounded, it may be, with perils and with snares, but still on a position of most commanding usefulness, from which she may exert her blessed influence, not only upon the happiness, the virtue, and the grandeur of this empire, but upon the cause of genuine Christianity throughout the world. But there stands one at her right hand, who nevertheless gravely counsels her that she cast herself down, because, truly, the Angels of God have a charge over her, to bear her up, lest at any time she dash her foot against a stone. To all such suggestions we are profoundly and solemnly convinced there needs but one reply:—Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

---

ART. II.—*Memoirs of the Administration of the Right Honourable Henry Pelham, collected from the Family Papers, and other authentic Documents.* By William Coxe, M.A. F.R.S. F.S.A. Archdeacon of Wilts. 2 vols. 4to. Longman & Co. 1829. Price 5*l.* 5*s.*

THE late Archdeacon Coxe has terminated his long and useful literary course, by a Work which not only, like its many predecessors from the same active pen, adds largely to our stores of authentic Historical information, but which by relieving the memories of two distinguished Statesman, who long directed the helm of power, from the load of obloquy under which it has been attempted to oppress them, may in truth be considered a labour of love. Mr. Coxe, notwithstanding many infirmities, which increasing age had brought upon him, and, among them, one most hostile to studious pursuits, a total loss of sight, has

executed his task with no less diligence and fidelity than he displayed while in the full enjoyment of earlier vigour: and this account of the Administration of Mr. Pelham, now before us, will deservedly rank in the same class as the *Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole*, to which it forms a sequel.

The materials from which this narrative is compiled are, 1st, The papers of Horatio, first Lord Walpole; "old Horace Walpole," as he is called by his younger, better-known, but less estimable nephew; 2ndly, those of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke; 3rdly, those of Sir Thomas Robinson, Mr. Keith, Archibald, Duke of Argyle, and Sir Charles Hanbury Williams; 4thly, but principally as a chart by which quicksands, sunken rocks, and other treacheries of the voyage,

ἐνθ' ἀκταὶ προβλήτες ἔσων, σπιλάδες τε, πάγοι τε,

may be escaped, Lord Orford's posthumous *Memoires of the last ten years of the reign of George II.*; 5thly, the papers of Mr. Pelham himself, communicated by the present Duke of Newcastle; and 6thly and lastly, those of Thomas, Duke of Newcastle, furnished by the late Earl of Chichester.

Of these ample and highly valuable materials, the Orford papers chiefly relate to the part taken by Mr. Pelham towards the close of Sir Robert Walpole's long Government. Those of Lord Hardwicke afford much secret correspondence till the year before Mr. Pelham's death. Lord Walpole's papers illustrate the whole course of the Pelham Ministry. The letters to the Duke of Argyle relate to the Rebellion of 1745. Sir Thomas Robinson's and Mr. Keith's to the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, and the busy intrigues for the election of the Archduke Joseph, as King of the Romans. The Hanbury papers, like every thing which proceeded from the same lively and vigorous source, in a few graphic touches vividly bring before our eyes many persons and incidents by which the scene is thronged. The private correspondence of the two Pelham brothers, and the other numerous documents communicated by Lord Chichester, necessarily form the most important portion of these volumes, and it is not without some difficulty that the Public at last enjoys them. Mr. Coxe, it seems, contemplated the present Work soon after the completion of his *Walpole Memoirs*; and having learned that Miss Pelham, the daughter of the Minister, possessed a large collection of papers, he applied for their use, through the medium of the Duchess Dowager of Newcastle. From some scruple, the lady refused to permit their inspection. Perhaps she thought that the events to which they related, were of too recent occurrence, to allow the entire

elucidation which they must receive from original documents; and that, persons were yet living who might be pained by unseasonable disclosures. If such were her motives their delicacy merits respect; but Historical Truth is too often a loser by the ignorance or the squeamishness which intercepts the records whereon it might be permanently established. It is to be feared that a large mass of papers relative to Mr. Pelham's administration has met an untimely fate from some such causes. Many documents remained in the hands of his Secretary, Mr. Roberts, who left them by Will "to Lady Katharine Pelham, the relict of Mr. Pelham, requesting her either to deliver them to her nephew, the Earl of Lincoln, or to destroy them; but notwithstanding the most diligent search, no such papers have been found, and there is reason to conclude that they were destroyed by the widow of Mr. Roberts."

On Miss Pelham's refusal, Mr. Coxe discontinued his intention. It was resumed on the publication of Horace Walpole's slanderous *Memoires*; and the Pelham papers having then passed into other hands, Mr. Coxe obtained permission to consult and employ them. The documents which were communicated by Lord Chichester have supplied many *lacunæ*, and have materially assisted the connection of the narrative. The Work was finished before the lamented death of its author, and left by him for publication to his surviving brother. It has been conducted through the press by Messrs. Hatcher and Rylance, the secretary and amanuensis of the deceased; who, from their long acquaintance with his designs, and his habits and methods of composition, have presented it with more assurance of strict adherence to the writer's own plan, than, for the most part, can be attained in a posthumous publication.

The family of Pelham claims an ancient place in English History; and a charge in its armorial bearings, a buckle of a sword-belt, with a portion of leather attached to it, records the valour of an ancestor who was a partaker in the glory of the capture of John, King of France, at the battle of Poitiers, by unhorsing him, hand to hand. In the reign of James I. a Baronetcy was granted to Thomas Pelham, whose son was elevated to the Peerage, as Baron Pelham of Laughton, in the county of Sussex, in 1706. Thomas and Henry, the chief subjects of our present consideration, were the sons of this nobleman by his second wife, Lady Grace Holles, youngest daughter of Gilbert, Earl of Clare, and sister of John Holles, Duke of Newcastle. Thomas was born in 1693, and was educated at Westminster School, and Clare Hall, Cambridge. The Will of his maternal uncle, just mentioned, entitled him to the name and

the vast property of the Holles family. In 1712, on the death of his father, he succeeded to the Barony of Pelham; in 1714, he was created Earl of Clare, and in the following year, Duke of Newcastle upon Tyne. In the same year he married the Lady Henrietta, daughter of Francis, Earl of Godolphin, and granddaughter of John, Duke of Marlborough. He was appointed Lord Chamberlain in 1717—received the Garter in the following year; and joined Sir Robert Walpole's administration as Secretary of State in 1724. In this post he continued, after the fall of Sir Robert Walpole, during Lord Granville's short Government—on the termination of which he became joint Minister with his brother.

Henry Pelham was three years younger than the Duke of Newcastle. His education was conducted at home under the care of Dr. Richard Newton; whom, when he became Principal of the once-favorite Hart Hall, his pupil followed to Oxford. During the Rebellion of 1715, we find him acting as a Captain in General Dormer's Regiment at the Battle of Preston; but it is probable that his commission was taken only for that particular service, and that it never was his intention to adopt the army as his profession. He represented the Borough of Seaford almost as soon as he became of age, and having embarked with Sir Robert Walpole, and filled some minor offices, he became Secretary at War, in 1724, and Paymaster of the Forces, in 1730.

On the breaking up of Sir Robert Walpole's Ministry, in 1741, the disjointed state of the parties opposed to him, prevented any of them from profiting by his fall, exclusively to their own aggrandizement; and the arrangement of the new Government was chiefly confided to the Duke of Newcastle. Mr. Pelham continued in his former post, and manifested his fidelity and attachment to the ex-minister, by frequent and powerful exertions in his defence, in the House of Commons. On this point we shall have occasion to speak more fully by-and-by. Lord Wilmington was at the head of the Treasury, and on his death, in July 1743, ensued the struggle which placed Mr. Pelham at the head of affairs, and at which, in strictness, this narrative may be said to commence.

The applicants for the important post vacated by Lord Wilmington, were Lord Bath (Mr. Pulteney), supported by the interest of Lord Carteret, whose personal influence over the King was at that time in its zenith; and Mr. Pelham, guided by the sagacious advice of Lord Orford, in his retirement. Lord Bath announced himself a candidate, but declined making any direct application while Lord Wilmington lived; Mr. Pel-



ham, on the contrary, at the suggestion of his noble and more provident friend, asked for the place, and obtained the King's promise of its reversion. The motives which induced George II. to act thus directly in opposition to the wishes of his favourite, are to be found in his dislike to Lord Bath, and in the extreme unpopularity of Lord Carteret; to whose charge were laid the scanty results of the battle of Dettingen so incommensurate with its glory, the dissensions among the Generals, the inactivity of the Army, and the national disappointment consequent upon these causes. The support of the Pelhams appeared to the King to be the readiest means of counteracting these unfavourable events.

As we have mentioned the Battle of Dettingen, we cannot forbear from stopping for a few sentences on that solitary triumph, which shed a brief and inefficient brightness on this dingy period of our History. It is well known that however honourable in itself, that victory was no other than a fortunate escape. The French Army in the field, under the Duke de Noailles, exceeded 50,000 men, after all the deductions which he had made, in order to strengthen his garisons and to cover Bavaria: including the force employed for those purposes, it amounted to more than 70,000. Lord Stair, on the other hand, had imprudently advanced without waiting for the junction of the Hessians and Hanoverians. The Austrian General viewed him with jealousy, and although the arrival of George II. prevented an open feud, but little concert could be expected between them. The Allied Army scarcely numbered 37,000 men; they were posted in a narrow valley on the bank of the Maine; from Aschaffenburg (from which the battle has been sometimes named,) to Dettingen; their supplies had been cut off; and, from want of forage, in a few days they must have been compelled to sacrifice their horses.

This was a situation of great danger, and the movement contemplated, in order to extricate themselves, was scarcely less so, in the very face of a skilful and active enemy. It was determined to fall back, by Dettingen, upon the Hessians and Hanoverians assembled at Hanau. It is but seldom that the details of a battle are presented so distinctly to a non-military reader as they are given in the extract below.

“ Meanwhile Noailles, perceiving the intention of the allies, to withdraw by the way of Dettingen, advanced to Seligenstadt, with a view to oppose their retreat; and, throwing two bridges over the Maine, he dispatched his nephew, the Duke of Grammont, with a force of twenty-three thousand men, across that river, to secure the pass in front of Dettingen, through which they had to march. Batteries were also



raised along the opposite bank, to sweep the narrow valley between Mount Spessart and the river, and particularly to rake the défilés of Dettingen. A corps of twelve thousand men was sent to occupy the bridge of Aschaffenburg, with a view farther to obstruct the movements of the allies, and to harass their rear, during their expected retreat.

“ Soon after midnight, on the 27th of June, the confederate forces struck their tents, and commenced their march towards Dettingen, in two columns. The king, apprehending that the principal attack of the French would be from Aschaffenburg, posted himself in the rear, with four battalions of English guards, four of Lunenburg, and the Hanoverian artillery. This was a fortunate disposition, as the guns of the allies silenced a hostile battery, and suspended the occupation of Aschaffenburg by the French. The repulse, however, of the advanced parties from Dettingen, and the movements of the corps under Grammont, which was seen crossing the Maine at Seligenstadt, soon convinced the allies, that the principal peril hovered on their front. Their columns, therefore, immediately halted, and the king advancing towards the scene of danger, directed the army to be drawn up, with the infantry in front, and the cavalry in the rear; its right extending towards the Spessart, and its left to the river, in front of Dettingen, the best practicable precautions being taken to secure both flanks.

“ Had the skilful disposition of Noailles been carried into effect, the British monarch, and his army, would have been exposed to a fearful hazard. They were cooped up in a plain, scarcely half a mile in breadth; their rear was menaced by the enemy on the side of Aschaffenburg; and their whole line raked by the batteries beyond the Maine, whose meandering banks afforded every facility for a concentrated fire, at the short distance of two hundred paces. In front, the Duke of Grammont had occupied Dettingen, covered by a morass and ravine, through which flowed a rivulet, passable only by a single bridge, and flanked by a village and a wood. Towards this point, farther reinforcements, from the army of Noailles, were already in motion.

“ On their march through the narrow défilé, leading to Dettingen, the allies suffered severely from the incessant fire of the enemy's batteries: and their sole hope consisted, in the possibility of cutting their way through the French lines, which possessed every advantage of nature and art. They fortunately escaped from almost inevitable destruction, through the impetuosity of the Duke of Grammont, who, conceiving that the advancing force was only part of the hostile army, contravened the judicious orders of his uncle, and, leaving his almost inaccessible position, passed the ravine, to give battle, on ground equally advantageous to both parties. His advance necessarily caused the French artillery, posted on the opposite bank of the river, to suspend their fire, lest it should injure their own troops, and thus afforded additional safety to the allies. The King of England, perceiving the approach of the French, alighted from his horse, and took his station among the British and Hanoverian infantry, on the right; while the Duke of Cumberland, as major-general, headed the first line of these forces. The conflict spread rapidly from wing to wing; and, in the first onset

the impetuous charge of the French cavalry, threw the allies into disorder, which was, however, soon repaired by the steadiness of the troops, animated by the presence and exertions of the king. The dense mass of the infantry, led by his majesty in person, soon broke and dispersed the enemy, who were exhausted by their brave and imprudent assault; and so great a slaughter ensued, that Noailles, perceiving the disaster to be irremediable, recalled the corps of Grammont, leaving the allies in possession of the field of battle.

"This retreat was made with such precipitation, that many were cut to pieces by their pursuers, before they reached the bridges, and many, throwing down their arms, fled to the mountains, and were taken prisoners without resistance. Others plunged into the river and were drowned; and numbers were swept away in their flight, by the fire of some pieces of artillery. The loss of the French was computed at six thousand men, among whom were one hundred and thirty officers, many of them of high rank; while the confederates lost only half that number.

"Although the Earl of Stair, and the Duke of Aremberg, who was wounded in the shoulder, behaved with great intrepidity, yet the victory was chiefly owing to the exertions of the King, and the Duke of Cumberland.

"The description given of the battle by an eye-witness, in the unstudied language of a soldier, affords the most unequivocal testimony of their heroic valour.

"The French fired at his Majesty from a battery of twelve cannon, but levelled too high. I saw the balls go within half a yard of his head. The Duke d'Aremberg desired him to go out of danger; he answered, 'Don't tell me of danger; I'll be even with them.' He is certainly the boldest man I ever saw. His horse being frightened, ran away with him, but he soon stopped him. The French got into the corner of a wood to flank our right.

"The King then drew his sword, and ordered the Hanoverian foot and horse, and some English, through the wood, and rode about like a lion. He drew them up in line of battle himself, ordered six cannons to the right, and bade them fire on the flank of the French. He stood by till they fired; they did great execution, killing thirty or forty at a shot. Then he went to the foot, and ordered them not to fire till the French came close, who were about one hundred yards distant. Then the French fired upon us directly, and the shot flew again as thick as hail. Then the King flourished his sword and said, 'Now boys; now for the honour of England; fire, and behave bravely, and the French will soon run.' Then the French foot gave an huzza, and fired very fast; but our men fired too fast for them, and soon made them retreat, and then gave another huzza, and fired. We had neither victuals, drink, nor tents to lie in, after the work was done. The King stood in the field till ten that night.

"The duke's intrepidity led his men into the midst of a storm of fire; and his horse, having received four wounds, ran away with him towards the enemy, where two Austrians, mistaking him for a French

officer, fired their pistols at his head, and he received a ball in his leg."—vol. i. p. 66.

The allies, in spite of their unexpected success, were too inferior in numbers, and too exhausted from their exertion, to profit by it more than to secure the retrograde march which they had originally projected. Philip Yorke, in his MS. Parliamentary Journal, has expressly stated, from George II.'s own account to a friend, that the King was extremely desirous to attack the French after the battle, but that his want of powder was so great that it was not thought advisable to renew the hazard of a general engagement.\* Lord Stair recommended pursuit, but Lord Stair's orders had already been disobeyed by the Hanoverian horse during the engagement, either through mistake or hostility. The spirits of the people of England were greatly elated on the arrival of the news of this victory; and their murmurs were proportionately loud when it was found that the allied army, after falling back upon its reinforcements, and obtaining at least an equality with its enemy, continued in its position, and suffered Noailles to complete his manœuvres, unmolested, through the remainder of the campaign. But the people were little aware of the secret obstacles to farther success. Neither the Cabinets nor the armies of the allies were united. Complicated negotiations for Peace diminished the eagerness of the Governments for active warfare; and there could be little hope that the motley and ill-assorted soldiers of different nations, who cherished a more deadly hatred against their companions than against their opponents in arms, would support each other effectually if led again to the field. The debates which ensued, in consequence of these events, respecting the policy of continuing the Hanoverian troops for the following year were long and animated. We need not state how much George II. had at heart the retention of this body, which he considered his personal *apanage*. There can be little doubt that the victory of Dettigen was greatly owing to his own display of bravery, a quality which must be largely accorded to him; and Horace Walpole, contrasting the great courage of the King with the bitterness of disappointment prepared for him, in case Parliament should refuse the supplies necessary for his Hanoverians, very happily cited in his speech a passage which Lucan has addressed in the person of Curio to Cæsar.

*"Livor edax tibi cuncta negat, Gallosque subactos  
Vix impunè feres."*

But to return to our main subject. Every body who has opened Horace Walpole's Correspondence, or the essence of it,

\* Philip Yorke's MS. *Parl. Jour.* Jan. 19, 1744.

which he has so elaborately concentrated in his *Memoires*, must have been struck by the persevering virulence with which he blackens the memory of the Pelhams. It is not in a few scattered passages that his sarcasm (that glittering and restless weapon which its possessor is never able to keep sheathed) breaks from restraint, as it were almost against his will; nor is it in sportiveness that he wields it. The strokes are repeated, heavy, trenchant, and unsparingly delivered.

“ The Sarazin was stout, and wondrous strong,  
And heaped blows like yron hammers great,  
For after blood and vengeance he did long.”

A very able writer in the *Quarterly Review* (April, 1822, No. LIII.) has satisfactorily traced Horace Walpole's enmity to its spring. He had been disappointed in more than one *job* by each of the brothers. This assertion is so clearly proved, the evidence upon which it rests is so conclusive, and so incapable of contradiction,—being derived from Walpole's own pen in incidental passages of his Correspondence,—that we are reluctant to weaken it by abridgement. The fact may be considered as established; and without seeking farther confirmation of it, we shall bring forward from Mr. Coxe's Work such particulars as show that Sir Robert Walpole did not partake in his son's bitterness of feeling; and that, notwithstanding that son represents him as often saying of the Duke of Newcastle, “ His name is Perfidy,”\* and observes of Mr. Pelham that when his brother was betraying Sir Robert and others of his friends, he “ shrugged up his shoulders, condemned the Duke, tried to make peace, but never failed to profit of their plan the moment it was accomplished,”†—Sir Robert himself, of whom it is said, and we believe truly, that he was frequently betrayed, but always without being deceived,‡ was corresponding with these traitors, in terms of the most unbounded cordiality and confidence, supporting them by his influence, instructing them by his experience, and teaching them the surest methods of retaining that power which Horace Walpole would fain have us believe they had wrested from his father's hand by dark, sinister, oblique, and tortuous machinations.

In a letter, dated August 23, 1742, while the Pulteney administration was yet oscillating, Lord Orford, (Sir Robert Walpole,) assures Mr. Pelham, “ I heartily wish you well, and wish you success for your own sake and the sake of the whole;” and subscribes himself, with a very unstatesmanlike warmth, “ most unfeignedly, under all circumstances, your most affectionate and

\* *Memoires*, vol. i. p. 143.

† *Ibid.* p. 145.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 205.

faithful friend and servant." Not long after, when Mr. Pelham had represented the intrigues by which Lords Bath and Carteret were endeavouring to oppress his interest by the introduction of more Tories into power, Lord Orford answers, "You must be the first wheel in this machine, and whoever will think of making your authority less, will create difficulties that will not easily be got through." About the middle of the following year, just after Lord Wilmington's death, and before the formal announcement of his successor had been made by the King, Lord Orford voluntarily addresses a letter of sound advice to Mr. Pelham on the critical juncture of his affairs; counsels him to gain time to strengthen himself, and to enter into no hasty engagement, and concludes, "I most undoubtedly am what you know me to be a most sincere well-wisher to the whole, and that makes your cause and interest my only point in view, and a very faithful friend to you and all that belong to you." So too, about a month afterwards, to the Duke of Newcastle, he presses the absolute necessity that Mr. Pelham should accept the Premiership, under whatever terms it may be offered, "however circumscribed, conditional or disagreeable, even under the probability of not being able to go on." . . . "I wish you all possible success, and I cannot hesitate in the support of a Government, upon which, I think, the whole depends."

Mr. Pelham received the notification of his appointment in a very honourable and manly letter from Lord Carteret, who, while he congratulated him, at the same time avowed that he had done his utmost in order to obtain the post for Lord Bath. This letter is dated August 16—27; more than a month after Lord Wilmington's death; and, as we have before stated that, while that nobleman was yet alive, Mr. Pelham had been promised the reversion of his place by the King, the doubts which were felt by himself and his friends during the Ministerial interregnum, and the unfeigned delight and astonishment with which the fulfilment of the royal promise was acknowledged, present an amusing, though not very honourable commentary on the fidelity of Courts. Mr. Pelham's confidence appears to have been shaken. "The communication of this appointment," says Mr. Coxe, "excited no less surprise than gratification in the two brothers;" and the Duke of Newcastle expresses himself almost in the same words in a hasty note to Lord Chancellor Hardwicke. "This evening a messenger arrived from the army, with the inclosed agreeable, but most surprising news."

But it is with Lord Orford's feelings upon this event that we are more immediately concerned. After sincere congratulation

and pointing out with consummate prudence the course which he thinks Mr. Pelham should adopt, both with his colleagues and with the King, he continues :—

“ I do not load you with personal assurances ; but I never knew a time when I thought it more incumbent upon me to exert myself in support of the government ; and I rejoice, for your sake and for my own, that affairs are put into your hands, where my private friendship, and my political opinion unite in engaging me to do all I can, and call upon me to act in character ; and how great had my difficulty been, if a contrary determination had put me under the necessity of demurring between the support of the king, and reconciling my conduct with the measures of those, who are incapable of acting a right part, where interest, ambition, or vengeance, can at all influence their actions.”—vol. i. p. 92.

and then,—adopting a figure eminently characteristic of the staunch old sportsman who, even in times the most dangerous, could not help opening his game-keeper's letters before those of the Ministers or even of the King,\*—“ Broad-bottom cannot be made for any thing that has a zest for Hanover. Whig it with all opponents that will parly, but ‘ware Tory’;” and in the end are a few words equally betokening affectionate familiarity and unbounded reliance upon his correspondent's secrecy and integrity. “ Dear Harry, I am very personal and very free, and put myself in your power. Remember me kindly to my Lord Duke.” The letter is followed by one from the Duke of Newcastle to Lord Orford, containing a most undisguised display of the relative position of his brother and himself to the other members of the Cabinet.

This position and the overture made by the Opposition for a junction with the new Minister, drew some additional advice from Lord Orford, which must have been of infinite value from the thorough knowledge displayed in it, not only of parties, but of human nature. The points most to our purpose are the following. No words can show more completely the intimate connection which subsisted between the writer and his correspondent.

“ You have my thoughts as they occur ; and, I am afraid, they will rather tend to puzzle the cause, than to clear it up ; but, although the difficulties are more obvious than expedients, truth and resolution will carry you through. Your cause is the cause of your king and country, and that must be made to do.

\* \* \* \* \*

“ The secrecy of a correspondence with Houghton, will become every day more necessary : for your sake and for mine, it must not be known that I enter at all into your affairs. Lord Bath, from the moment he was disappointed, turned his eye upon me. He thinks he shall be

\* Walpoliana.



stronger upon stirring old questions, and reuniting numbers personally against me, than in any other light. He will try to fling my weight into your scale, in order to sink it. I write not out of any apprehensions; but my indiscretion will be thought very great, if it should be known that I begin to provoke valour; and I am too free with some persons, if I was not safe in your hands."—vol. i. p. 102.

and again, after some much more than hints as to the fittest method of personal communication with the King,—a subject so delicate that a veteran Minister might reasonably shrink even if his right hand were to ask advice on it from his left,—he concludes a second letter; "I am afraid I have by this time tired you; and indeed I am interrupted and called away, but I am so heartily and sincerely concerned at the event of things, that I seem I know not where. The share you have in this great event is not the least part of my anxiety. I love you; I fear for you; but courage, dear Harry, and resolution will carry you through. My best respects to my Lord Duke. Adieu. God prosper you."—vol. i. p. 106.

We need not do more than refer to the *Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole*\* for the timely aid which Mr. Pelham received from this great Statesman during the agitation of an important question, upon which we have already touched, the dismissal of the Hanoverian troops. Lord Orford well knew how deeply that measure, if adopted, would wound the feelings and the honour of the King, and how irremediably its advisers would be estranged from the royal affections; moreover he saw the political advantages to be derived from keeping up this band of auxiliaries, which could not be supplied from any other source. Mr. Pelham's views coincided with those of Lord Orford; and strengthened by such support and approbation, he braved the unpopularity of renewing the grant, and succeeded in removing the objections entertained against it by his brother and other members of administration. These details have long since been presented to the Public, and therefore we forbear from dwelling on them. It is most probable that Mr. Pelham owed the increase of royal favour to his success on this question. The Whigs were rooted in power, and the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, with the unlimited controul of that department, was united in the person of Mr. Pelham, to the first Lordship of the Treasury. The Paymaster of the forces was conferred on Mr. Winnington, a staunch Walpolian.

The campaign of 1744 was languidly conducted on the part of the Allies. After the proposition and rejection of numerous other schemes, an attack upon Lisle was determined. The allied forces accordingly marched into the plains in the vicinity of that

\* Ch. 62.



fortress, but contented themselves by encamping therein without any farther assault. The French Journals and Theatres, as might be imagined, teemed with satirical allusions to this lazy generalship, and Mr. Coxe has presented us with the following humorous pasquinades. The first is from a newspaper, professing to detail the progress of the Allies.

“ On the 30th of July they (the allied forces) encamped within four or five miles of Lisle; on the 31st they lost a Scotch volunteer before it, and had a captain wounded and taken prisoner. They looked also for a field of battle, but by good providence no enemy was near. On the 1st instant they were put in fear, but, as it happened, danger was at a distance; on the 2nd they slept sound; on the 3rd the right wing foraged; on the 4th the whole army was reviewed; on the 5th they rested; on the 6th the left wing foraged; on the 7th did nothing; on the 8th relieved the free companies of Austrians at Lanoy, and received a trumpet from Count Saxe, about the exchange of prisoners; on the 9th sent him back again; on the 10th the Hanoverians foraged, and had a gun fired at them from Lisle; on the 11th the Britons foraged, and had no gun fired at them; and the captain that was taken at Lisle, being exchanged, returned.”—*Gent. Mag. for Aug. 1744*, xiv.

The second is from a burlesque piece, represented on the stage, in which

“ Harlequin in scene 1, represents an English officer, whom Scaramouch asks, whither he is going? ‘ To the siege of Lisle (answers he), which we shall take in five days.’ *Scar.*—‘ You have not a sufficient force.’ *Harl.*—‘ Don’t mind that—one Englishman will beat five French. *Huzza, boys.*’ *Scar.*—‘ But where is your artillery?’ *Harl.*—‘ Odd so! (*scratching his head*), we have forgot it.—Let me think—it is at Ostend, or Antwerp, if it has escaped the late storm.’—In the succeeding scenes, Harlequin appears, with the loss of both arms and one leg, but declares that he is still rising to preferment. Scaramouch asks him, in scene 4, what are you now? *Harl.*—‘ I have the pleasure to see myself a lieutenant-general—but must lament one thing; the French dogs whom we have beaten, have run away with all our horses.’ *Scar.*—‘ Very strange, indeed; supply yourselves from the Dutch and Hanoverians, for they dare not use them.’ In the last scene, Harlequin comes in without a head. *Scar.*—‘ What do you call yourself now, Monsieur?’ *Harl.*—‘ I am general of the ——.’ (probably of the British.) *Scar.*—‘ Indeed, Monsieur Harlequin, you have two wooden arms and one wooden leg; but you must have another qualification yet, that is, a wooden head.’”—vol. i. p. 162.

The popular antipathy to Lord Carteret was greatly increased by this inglorious conduct of the war, which was chiefly under his direction; but the King’s ill humour appears to have been concentrated upon the Duke of Newcastle, who speaks warmly in his letters of the disagreeable temper and behaviour to which he was compelled to submit; and of the Sovereign manifesting “ all

the resentment that can be shown by manner, by looks, by harsh expressions, to those and to me in particular, who he thinks have obstructed his views, and are actuated by principles different from what is most agreeable to him; and that in the presence of the person (Lord Carteret) who equally recommends himself by the success or the miscarriage of the measures which the King wishes." If the Pelhams were to remain in power, Lord Carteret's removal became a *sine quâ non*: but it required no little courage to dare the whole tempest of Royal displeasure, which so bold an effort against a favourite could not fail to draw down. The Duke of Newcastle more than once resolved to terminate the struggle by his own resignation, and probably would have done so, had it not been for the greater firmness of his Brother and of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke. The latter, at the end of October, drew up a Memorial, which is printed by Mr. Coxe from a draught in the Newcastle papers. It is a masterly *exposé* of the evils of the existing foreign administration, and we regret that its length forbids its extraction.

On the 1st of November this paper was formally presented to the King, by the Duke of Newcastle in person, in the names of the Lord Chancellor, Mr. Pelham, Lord Harrington, and himself, and with the approbation of several other members of the Cabinet. To his surprise, and no doubt to his great annoyance (for the Duke was an eminent fidget) it was quietly returned to him, after a few hours, unaccompanied by a single observation. But Mr. Pelham and the Chancellor strongly enforced it in separate audiences. The King manifested the utmost repugnance either to change his continental policy or to dismiss Lord Granville, as Lord Carteret had recently become by the death of his mother. And at this point, at which Lord Orford, if ever he entertained any misgiving of the sincerity of the Pelhams, might have inflicted a signal vengeance upon them, he on the contrary gave, as it were, the casting vote in their favour, and consolidated their power. The King directed Lord Cholmondeley to request the attendance of his father-in-law at a private consultation before the meeting of Parliament, in the hope no doubt that such an especial mark of confidence would secure his adherence to Lord Granville's otherwise falling interests: and that under the shadow of this protection the favourite might eventually triumph.

"The veteran statesman, however, was too well acquainted with the condition of parties, to believe that Lord Granville could maintain his ground, and too sincere in his friendship, to act contrary to the interests of Mr. Pelham. Accordingly, in his reply to Lord Cholmondeley, he declined entering into any consultation before the meeting of parliament; and, at the same time, frankly avowed his readiness to obey the royal commands, by repairing to London. Yet he did not scruple to express

his disapprobation of the system of foreign politics, and forebore to give any encouragement whatever to the hopes of Lord Granville. But, such was the reliance still placed on his aid, that another royal message was dispatched to hasten his departure from Houghton.

“Meanwhile, the Pelhams importuned the king for an immediate decision, as the time fixed for the meeting of parliament would allow no farther delay. But his Majesty, anxious to resist these compulsory demands, made another effort to protract the fall of Lord Granville. He sent Colonel Selwyn to meet Lord Orford, who had commenced his journey from Houghton, on the 19th of November; and again condescended to solicit his immediate advice and assistance. In reply to this solicitation, his Lordship frankly and strenuously recommended his Majesty to comply with the wishes of the majority in the cabinet; and the king, finding all parties united against his favourite minister, reluctantly followed the advice. Accordingly, on the 23rd of November, his Majesty announced his resolution to the Chancellor, that Lord Granville should resign.

“On the following day, the seals of the Secretary of State were transferred from Lord Granville to Lord Harrington, who was approved by the king, and strongly recommended by his brother ministers. This arrangement, therefore, was finally settled only three days before the meeting of parliament, and affords a striking proof of the difficulty with which the royal acquiescence was extorted.”—vol. i. p. 189, 190.

The King bore these changes very ungraciously; and few pictures of the old Lion in his den (as Horace Walpole somewhere describes George II. at his Levee) have been more happily sketched than that which will be found in the conversation below, from notes made by Lord Hardwicke himself, and communicated to the Duke of Newcastle. The paper is, in every way, one of extraordinary curiosity and interest.

“*January 5th, 1744-5.*

“*Chancellor.*—Sir, I have forborne for some time to intrude upon your Majesty, because I know that, of late, your time has been extremely taken up. But, as the parliament is to meet again in a few days, I was desirous of an opportunity of waiting upon your Majesty to know if you had any commands for me. If there is any thing, that it might be particularly agreeable to your Majesty to give me your commands upon.

[*Pause of above a minute, and the King stood silent.*]

“*Chancellor.*—Sir, From some appearances which I have observed of late, I have been under very uneasy apprehensions that I may have incurred your Majesty’s displeasure; and though I am not conscious to myself of having deserved it, yet nothing ever did, or ever can, give me so great concern, and so sensible a mortification, in my whole life.

[*Pause of above a minute, and the King silent.*]

“*Chancellor.*—I beg your Majesty will have the goodness and condescension for me to hear me a few words upon the motives of my own

conduct, the nature of your present situation, and the manner in which I humbly think it may be improved, for your service.

“ Whatever representations may have been made to your Majesty, I, and those with whom I have acted, if I know them at all, have had no view in the whole that has passed of late but your service, and that of the public. I considered with myself, that the principal point of the public service, and your Majesty's great object at present, is the carrying on the war; and though your Majesty may have been told that we were against the war, that was a misrepresentation; we were zealously for it, but we were for it upon some practicable plan, and in such a way as we might see that it could be supported. I was always convinced, that as your Majesty was engaged, it was necessary to be carried on, until an opportunity should arise of making a reasonable peace for the sake of your Majesty, and for the sake of your allies. I saw at the same time that in the condition and disposition in which your allies are at present, it would require vast sums of money, and perhaps greater annual expenses than this country ever bore in any former war, either in King William's or Queen Anne's reign. It would be impossible for any administration to carry them through, without taking some methods to reconcile the minds of men to the management of the war, and making it in some degree popular. This could not possibly be done, without taking the nation to a certain degree along with them. I beg your Majesty would consider the situation you are now in. Your old servants, and the old corps of Whigs who are connected with them, are ready and zealous to support you. The gentlemen who are newly come in, have come in upon that foundation; and have bound themselves by their declarations and engagements to support, by themselves, and their friends and followers, the measures for carrying on the war; and I think the strongest of those measures has been opened to them. The gentlemen who have lately gone out of your service have, for reasons best known to themselves, declared that they will concur in all measures to support the war, and pretend to build a merit upon it. For my part, I never saw or heard of a situation which, if rightly improved, afforded a prospect of greater advantage to the Crown than this. In parliament there have been generally three parties, the court party, a determined opposition, and a flying squadron. But I never yet saw a time in which all these three parties were brought to declare for the support of government, in the grand essential measures of that government, and of which for some time all other measures will be but subordinate to it. There are two points for the support of the war. One is, the great proposition\* from Russia; and though that cannot be brought about without a large new burthen, yet, if it can be turned in any practicable shape, I see a great disposition to make it effective. The other is the additional subsidy to the Queen of Hungary, which is to be a method of keeping up your Majesty's Hanover troops, for two views combined together; I mean the defence of your German dominions, and the support of the common cause, according to the general reason of the war.

\* For taking thirty thousand Russian troops into the pay of Great Britain.

"*The King.*—As to that, if they do not like it I am very easy. I do not desire it for my own sake. I can call home my troops, for the defence of my own dominions.

"*Chancellor.*—I do not mention it, in the view of a particular point of your Majesty's, but as part of the general system of carrying on the war, and as an instance of *their* readiness, to comply with expedients to get over their old prejudices. But, Sir, there still remains something very material behind; how this situation may be best improved, and the advantage of it not be lost?

"*The King.*—I have done all you asked of me. I have put all my power into your hands, and I suppose you will make the most of it.

"*Chancellor.*—The disposition of places is not enough, if your Majesty takes pains to show the world that you disapprove of your own work.

"*The King.*—My work! I was forced; I was threatened.

"*Chancellor.*—I am sorry to hear your Majesty use those expressions. I know of no force: I know of no threats. No means were employed but what have been used in all times, the humble advice of your servants, supported by such reasons as convinced them that the measure was necessary for your service.

"*The King.*—Yes, I was told that I should be opposed.

"*Chancellor.*—Never by me, Sir, nor by any of my friends. How others might represent us I do not pretend to know. But whatever had been our fate, and though your Majesty had determined on the contrary side to what you did, we would never have gone into an opposition against the necessary measures for carrying on the war, and for the support of your government and family. For myself, I have served your Majesty long, in a very laborious situation, and am arrived at a length of service which makes me very indifferent as to personal considerations. Taking your money only is not serving you; and nothing can enable me to do that, but being put into a possibility and capacity of doing so, by your gracious countenance and support. But, Sir, to return to what I was mentioning, of making the proper use, and of taking advantage of your present situation.

"*The King.*—The change might have been made, by bringing in proper persons; and not those brought in who had most notoriously distinguished themselves by a constant opposition to my government.

"*Chancellor.*—If changes were to be made, in order to gain strength, such a force must be brought in as could bring that strength along with them, otherwise it would have been useless. On that account, it was necessary to take in the leaders, and that with the concurrence of their friends; and if your Majesty looks round the House of Commons you will find no man of business, or even of weight, left, capable of heading or conducting an Opposition.

[*Pause—the King silent.*]

"*Chancellor.*—Sir, permit me to say, the advantage of such a situation, is a real advantage gained to the Crown. Ministers may carry their point in parliament, and frequently do so, by small majorities, and in this way they may struggle on long; but, by the same way, the Crown always loses both its lustre and its strength. But when things

are put upon a national foot, by a concurrence of the heads of all parties, and yet so as not to discourage your old friends, then a real solid strength is gained to the Crown; and the king has both more power to carry his present measures, for the support of government, and is more at liberty to chuse and act as he pleases. Your ministers, Sir, are only your instruments of government.

“*The King.* [*Smiles.*—Ministers are the king, in this country.

“*Chancellor.*—If one person is permitted to engross the ear of the Crown, and invest himself with all its powers, he will become so in effect; but that is far from being the case now, and I know no one, now in your Majesty's service, that aims at it. Sir, the world without doors is full of making schemes of an administration for your Majesty for the future; but, whatever be your intention for the future, I humbly beg that you would not spoil your own business for the present.

“*The King.*—I suppose you have taken care of *that*. If you have not success, the nation will require it at your hands.

“*Chancellor.*—If right measures are not pursued, nor proper care taken, then the nation will have reason to require it; but success is in no man's power; and that success must greatly depend on your Majesty's showing a proper countenance and support to your servants, and to what you have already done. I humbly beg leave to recommend it to your Majesty, for your own sake, and for the sake of carrying those points which are essential to you and the kingdom. In times of peace, sometimes a session of parliament may be played with, and events waited for; but in a time of war, and of such a war as this is, the case is quite different, and the ill success of it will not be the ill success of the ministry, but of the Crown. It may be the loss of the whole.

[*Pause—the King silent.*]

“*Chancellor.*—Sir, there is another advantage that may be made of your present situation, which I think a very material one. The swarms of libels, which have gone about of late years, have greatly hurt the credit, and weakened the strength of government; and that weakness has produced an impunity to them. From this source has sprung much of the confusion and disorder which have been so justly complained of. I should think the present situation would afford an opportunity greatly to suppress and keep under that spirit; and, though this is the season of the year in which they used to abound, scarce any thing material of that kind has appeared this winter.

“*The King.*—I myself have seen twenty,

“*Chancellor.*—What strokes of that kind your Majesty may have seen, in the weekly papers, I cannot take upon me to say; but I have yet seen hardly any libellous pamphlets. In the last winter, before this time, there were volumes of virulent pamphlets published, which did infinite mischief. But, whatever has happened hitherto, if this work gains some solidity and\* . . . in the nation, it will strengthen your Majesty's hands, and enable your magistrates to punish them effectually. Those who, perhaps, used to patronize and support them, will turn against them, and juries will be found now ready to convict them.

[*Pause—the King silent.*]

\* Illegible.



"*Chancellor.*—Sir, I ask your Majesty's pardon for troubling you so long, but I thought it my duty to lay my thoughts before you."—vol. i. pp. 199—203.

We have stated more than enough to show the close and intimate connection which subsisted between the Pelhams and Lord Orford till the close of November, 1744, when mainly through his assistance their chief opponent was dislodged from the Cabinet. But little more than three months after that event Lord Orford died, and no occurrence in the course of the Pelham administration, although it survived the loss many years, was more unfavourable to its interests. Mr. Coxe has described its effects as follows:—

"Towards the latter end of this session of parliament, Mr. Pelham sustained a severe loss, in the death of the Earl of Orford, on the 18th of March. From his entrance into public life he had recognized a constant friend and patron in this eminent statesman, who had not only contributed to his elevation, but had smoothed many official difficulties by his advice, and private mediation with the king. A peculiarly unfavourable result of this loss was the want of a connecting link with the late ex-minister's adherents; who, on his death, naturally separated into different parties, and many of whom relaxed in their attachment to Mr. Pelham, while others joined the ranks of opposition. Even Mr. Horace Walpole, the son of Lord Orford, although he continued for a time to follow the example of his father, in supporting Mr. Pelham, yet altered his behaviour through some cause of umbrage; and not only became his determined opponent during life, but even in his *Posthumous Memoirs*, indulged an unjustifiable and splenetic prejudice against his memory.

"No disappointment or personal mortification, however, could weaken the grateful recollection which Mr. Pelham cherished for his first and inalienable patron; to whose merits he delighted to render ample justice on all occasions, public as well as private, while he ever avowed a grateful sense of his favours. To the latest period of his administration he pursued the same course, and was proud to acknowledge that he considered himself as the pupil and follower of Sir Robert Walpole, in the science of politics and finance."—vol. i. pp. 228, 229.

If we admit Horace Walpole's opposite statements of the treacherous conduct of the two Brothers to his Father to be correct, we become involved in one of the two following difficulties. Either Lord Orford was acquainted with their perfidy, (as Horace Walpole certainly implies, or, we might rather say, asserts,) or even to his last moments he confided in their integrity. If they were dishonest to him, and he believed them to be so, he was a most egregious hypocrite; contrary to his received character, without adequate motive, and at a season in which ambition had ceased to exist in him, and he was hovering over the verge of the grave. If, on the other hand, they betrayed him, and succeeded



to the very end in keeping up the mask of concealment, two persons of whose abilities the writer of the *Memoires* delights to speak contemptuously, and of whom it is no disparagement to admit that they did not equal Lord Orford, cajoled, tricked, deceived, played upon, and profited by a Statesman of unrivalled sagacity; one whose chief study through a long life had been the several arts and circumstances by which mankind is influenced and controlled, and the means by which he might direct and guide those around him to the furtherance of his own purposes. Each of these suppositions is almost equally incredible; and we far more readily attribute the distorted and evil-coloured portraits which Horace Walpole has drawn, to his own oblique and jaundiced vision. That most amusing writer, (for such every one must admit him to be after all deductions,) in the conduct of life was avaricious, narrow-minded, morose and splenetic. The same spirit which denied a guinea to Chatterton when starving, and banqueted his unexpected guests upon rations of hashed mutton, added with reluctance to those already prepared for himself, rendered him as chary of his praise as he was of his money; and when disappointed in his passion for gold—the single love which he was capable of feeling—he became lavish of malignant hate, the only prodigality in which he was ever known to indulge.

The public events which succeeded Lord Orford's death were of a troublous nature. The loss of the battle of Fontenoy was almost immediately followed by the landing of Charles Edward; and the Duke of Cumberland was hastily recalled, after a defeat which left his honour untarnished, to a victory which has classed his name among the most unpopular in our History. An adventurer, ill-provided with arms and money, and heading an irregular rabble of a few thousand mountaineers, shook England to its centre, and nearly succeeded in changing its dynasty. But however chargeable with unstatesmanlike neglect and want of foresight may be the general measures of the Government which permitted the rise and increase of these disasters, there is sufficient evidence in the volumes before us that the Pelhams were neither blind nor improvident. From their correspondence with the Duke of Argyle, it is plain that they eagerly seconded his wishes of increasing the force in Scotland, before the threatened invasion, by arming and training such of the natives as were known to be well-affected; and if this course had been pursued, it is probable that the banner of the Stuarts would never have been unfurled beyond the valley of Glensinnan. But the rest of the Cabinet slumbered in idle security, and the King's eyes were bent solely upon Germany; nor was it till the tempest burst upon them with a fury which their apathy had permitted to gather strength, that they discovered the full danger of being shelterless.

We need not detail the well-known progress of the Rebellion. The King was in Hanover. The Duke of Argyle, alarmed for his personal safety, fled from Scotland at the moment in which his presence was most needed there; almost the whole disposable military force of the Country was employed in Flanders; the rebels had succeeded in placing themselves between Edinburgh and the troops opposed to them; and the Cabinet was so distracted and without concert, that the proposition which appeared to present the only chance of safety,—that of sending for reinforcements from the Continent,—was vehemently opposed by some of its members, and condemned by Lord Granville, who, though not in office, still possessed the Royal ear. “England,” wrote Mr. Fox, “Wade says, and I believe, is for the first comer; and if you can tell whether the 6000 Dutch and the ten battalions of English, or 5000 French or Spaniards, will be here first, you know our fate;” . . . and again, “had 5000 landed in any part of this island a week ago, I verily believe the entire conquest would not have cost them a battle. . . . Imagine everything in confusion; obstinate, angry, determined impracticability throughout.”

Cope was disgracefully defeated at Preston Pans, with the loss of his tents, baggage, cannon and military chest. So entire was the rout, that he did not deem himself safe till he had escaped with the small remnant of his force as far as Berwick; and, with the exception of the garrisons of the fortresses, not a single Royal soldier was to be found in Scotland; nor, indeed, was there any army between the Rebels and London. The imprudent delay of Charles Edward for six weeks at Edinburgh, enabled the Government in some measure to recover from its panic, and to collect its troops; and the pressure of immediate danger gave the Pelhams the full ascendancy which hitherto had been denied to them. Vigour and activity succeeded to imbecility and inertness; and the advance of the Duke of Cumberland, at the head of a strong and well-appointed army, stemmed the onset of the Rebels, and drove them in hasty retreat from Derby. Even the defeat of Hawley, at Falkirk, by inferior numbers, which was scarcely less discreditable to disciplined troops than that before suffered by Cope, but little retarded the approaching catastrophe. The efforts made by the French to reinforce the Rebel army, and to hazard a descent at Dover, were frustrated by the watchfulness and skill of Byng and Vernon. Motions for large supplies were carried through the Commons without obstruction, and one general spirit of loyalty to the House of Brunswick appeared to pervade the great body of the nation.

It might have been supposed that the gratitude of the King would have been proportioned to the ardour manifested by his

servants during this season of peril. But scarcely had the drooping spirits of the Country been revived, nor yet had the danger wholly passed away, when personal feelings were allowed to counterbalance the public good; and while the Monarchy still tottered, and an hereditary claimant to the Throne still asserted his right, in arms, within the bosom of the Country, a total revolution was effected in the administration. George II. became impatient of the determination shown by his present Cabinet to abandon the extensive system of Continental war which he had hitherto pursued, and angrily resisted their importunities that Mr. Pitt should be admitted as Secretary at War.

“He addressed himself to the Earls of Bath and Granville, at that time the most unpopular noblemen in the kingdom. He complained to Lord Bath, that he was a prisoner on his throne; governed by a party who engrossed all power; compelled to receive into his service persons whom he had cause to dislike; and permitted to have no share in the management of his own affairs. He therefore solicited assistance, to liberate himself from this irksome bondage; and confided to him and Lord Granville full powers to form a new administration, which should be inclined to prosecute the war on more vigorous principles. He expressed his sanguine hopes of the attachment of Lord Harrington, who principally owed his elevation to his favour; and calculated on the concurrence of Mr. Winnington, who was deemed a proper person to manage the House of Commons. He looked forward also to the support of other persons in both Houses, particularly of Sir John Barnard, whom he supposed to be adverse to the ascendancy of the Pelhams, and to whom he intended to offer the Chancellorship of the Exchequer.

“Lord Bath received this delicate commission with some degree of hesitation, but answered for the concurrence of Lord Granville, and declared that ultimate success must depend on the king's own firmness. As the principal difficulty to be apprehended was that of raising the supplies, Lord Bath first addressed himself to Mr. Gideon, and the other monied men in the city, and procured from them the promise of a loan, on terms which were considered as more advantageous than those already obtained by Mr. Pelham. He then applied to different members of both Houses, and calculating that he should succeed in separating the several parties which were connected with the ministry, he returned to the king to communicate the result of his proceedings. The plan of an administration, of which he and Lord Granville were to be the leaders, as First Lord of the Treasury and Secretary of State, was then sketched out; and in retiring from the closet, on the 6th of February, he exultingly said to Lord Harrington, whom he met in the ante-chamber, ‘I have advised the king to negative the appointment of Mr. Pitt, and to pursue proper measures on the continent.’

“The communication did not produce the effect that was intended, for it called forth from Lord Harrington only a cold and severe remark, that ‘those who dictated in private, should be employed in public.’ Notwithstanding this indication of his sentiments, Lord Harrington was,

on the next day, summoned into the closet. The king condescended to employ every argument and intreaty calculated to detach him from his party; but finding them all unavailing, he gave way to a transport of indignation, and bitterly reproached the inflexible secretary with ingratitude.

"The Pelhams and their friends were now sensible that the die was cast, and a meeting of the party took place on the ensuing evening, at the house of the Lord Chancellor. All their adherents proving faithful, a resolution was taken to convince the king of the weakness and impolicy of his scheme, by a prompt and general resignation. Lord Harrington relinquished the seals on the 10th, and his example was followed by the Duke of Newcastle. On the morrow Mr. Pelham and the Duke of Bedford, with all the members of the Board of Treasury and Admiralty, resigned; and in conformity with the general resolution, the whole of the ministry either renounced their employments, or expressed their intention to retire. This event produced a deep and general sensation of regret throughout the country. The change was regarded as the signal of the most fatal calamities, and the levees of the two brothers were crowded beyond all former precedent. Even the Duke of Cumberland, with all his respect for the king his father, could not refrain from testifying, in the strongest terms, his concern at a proceeding which threatened the dissolution of the Whig interest, that had placed and maintained his family on the throne."—vol. i. pp. 288—290.

The subsequent proceedings are given in a Letter of great interest from the Duke of Newcastle to Lord Chesterfield, but it is too long for extraction. The termination is well known. Lord Bath, who had accepted the Treasury, soon found that majorities were hopeless in either House, and stated in the closet the impossibility of gaining them. Lord Granville, to whom both Seals had been committed, one for himself, the other for any friend whom he might choose to name, boldly advised the King to summon the Commons, and declare from the Throne to them, and to the House of Lords, what usage he had received from his servants.\* But the King, however fond of Hanover, was not yet content to retire upon his Electorate—a retreat to which such an experiment might have led; and on the Wednesday he sent to those who had resigned on the Monday and Tuesday, to desire that they would return to their old employments. The Wits and the Pelhams equally profited by this singular political convulsion. One among the first observed, that during this period of suspense it was not safe to walk the streets at night for fear of being pressed to be a Cabinet Counsellor; and another published a penny *History of the Long Administration*, concluding with the following paragraph:—

"And thus endeth the second and last part of this astonishing administration, which lasted forty-eight hours, three quarters, seven minutes

\* Glover's *Posthumous Memoirs*, p. 31.

and eleven seconds, which may truly be called the most wise and most honest of all administrations, the Minister having, to the great astonishment of all wise men, never transacted one rash thing, and what is more marvellous, left as much money in the Treasury as he found in it. This worthy History I have faithfully recorded in this mighty volume, that it may be read with the valuable Works of our immortal Countryman, Thomas Thumb, by our children, grand-children and great-grand-children to the end of the world."

The Pelhams naturally were much strengthened by the failure of this attack. They could no longer be resisted by the King, and they had won the cordial support of the people. Triumphant in all other points, they prudently forbore to exasperate the Royal prejudices, by urging the appointment of Mr. Pitt as an English Minister, and as a satisfactory compromise, they obtained for him the lucrative post of Joint-Vice-Treasurer of Ireland.

Meanwhile, during this political broil, the Duke of Cumberland was steadily advancing to the suppression of the Rebellion. The severity of his proceedings has ever been a matter of deep and indelible reproach; and the Newcastle papers have preserved in his letters numerous instances of the evil impression which his mind had received of Scotland, and the consequent necessity which he felt of visiting her with a heavy arm.

"All in this Country," he writes from Aberdeen on the 4th of April, 1746, "are almost to a man Jacobites, and mild measures will not do. You will find the whole of the Laws of this *ancient kingdom* (the sneer is remarkable) must be new modelled. . . . Were I to enumerate the villains and villanies this Country abounds in, I should never have done. In short, there does not remain the least vestige of any government throughout the whole; . . . do not imagine that threatening military execution, and many other such things, are pleasant to do; but nothing will go down without it in this part of the world."

His success at Culloden, (which, however vaunted as a great battle, was little else than a massacre,) as may be supposed, increased his readiness to shed blood. He had been fleshed, and his appetite was whetted. Six days after his victory he writes again to the Duke of Newcastle:—"If we had destroyed every man of them, such is the soil that Rebellion would sprout out again, if a new system of Government is not found out for this Country;" and within a few days more he accuses one half of the Magistrates of Scotland as aiders or abettors of the Rebellion, and declares that the others dared not act lest they should offend their chiefs, or hang their relations. He also affirms that the Jacobite principle would not be eradicated until a new generation should have arisen; and it was for the sake of forcing this generation into precocious forwardness, that he used every means, as far as in him lay, of making room for it, by cutting off that which

existed. That we do not overcharge this picture will be admitted by all who contemplate the spirit of one more extract from his correspondence, which is equally distinguished by badness of taste and bitterness of feeling. It is dated about the middle of July, when he had already indulged the savageness of his vengeance, and dabbled in the slaughter of unresisting fugitives for four long months.

"I am sorry to leave this Country in the condition it is in; for all the good that we have done has been *a little bloodletting*, which has only weakened the madness, but not at all cured: and I tremble for fear that this vile spot may still be the ruin of this island, and of our family; for I know that when we come to be heard, you will imagine almost every word I say slander, and that I am prejudiced against them: so I am, but by so many different incidents that have happened, that I recollect the whole with horror."

It is unnecessary to comment upon the cruel and unseasonable sportiveness of some of the above expressions. They remind us of the least agreeable parts of Sir Walter Scott's Novels—the professional witticisms of the executioners in *Quentin Durward*; and the Duke of Cumberland, while employing them, must be content to rank in the same class with the memorable *Petit André* and *Troix Echelles*. Neither did his Royal Highness atone for the virulence of his hostility by a corresponding strength of affection towards his friends. It will scarcely be credited that, in his despatches announcing the victory of Culloden, he omitted the customary recommendation by which the promotion of the bearer is secured. The Duke himself reaped most substantial benefits from his success. £40,000 per annum was immediately settled upon himself and his heirs male; but it was not until the Minister pointed out the ungenerous omission, that the forgotten aide-de-camp received his share of advantage.

"Poor Bury," wrote the Duke of Newcastle, "was much mortified to have been tossed about so long at sea. I carried him to the King, and he was most graciously received, and very much questioned; and he behaved like a hero and a politician. *Had your Royal Highness dropped one word in his favour, his business, I believe, would have been done. We will do our best, in our circumstances; but I wish your Royal Highness would enable us, by a line from you.*"

It is by no means our intention to enter into the dull and tedious labyrinth of the general politics, or the petty Court intrigues, of this leaden period; than which scarcely any in our History presents fewer points of interest, or less of public virtue. We shall confine ourselves to a few incidents which tend to illustrate the character of the Pelham brothers, or which in themselves offer



any remarkable claims upon our attention. The case of Lord Harrington partakes of both these properties. We have already mentioned that Nobleman as having been the first of the Ministers who tendered his resignation in February, 1746; and the King, who was obstinately implacable in his resentments, poured the whole artillery of his wrath upon this devoted *forlorn hope*. In November of the same year, Lord Harrington succeeded Lord Chesterfield as Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland—an office which, at that time, was usually held for not more than three years. The King, though most reluctantly, at Mr. Pelham's earnest request, in this instance, extended the time to four. Lord Harrington was a younger brother, and his purse, not less than his honour, demanded that he should not quit this high and lucrative post, without a transfer to some efficient office in England; and such Mr. Pelham designed for him as Secretary of State or Lord President. The correspondence before us sufficiently proves the deep interest felt by Mr. Pelham on this point, and effectually contradicts the malignant statement of Horace Walpole to the contrary. That writer has told us, that "the Pelhams sacrificed Lord Harrington to their master, astonished at their complaisance, in order to bargain for other victims on his part, which they would have forced, not purchased, if there had been any price necessary but their own ingratitude." We do not profess very clearly to understand this complicated and overloaded accusation; but, as far as we can comprehend it, that is, that the Pelhams sacrificed Lord Harrington, we will examine it by their Letters relating to him.

In May, 1750, Mr. Pelham, in writing to his brother, notices Lord Harrington's very natural anxiety about his approaching removal, and the great difficulty which he (Mr. Pelham) feels in answering his inquiries, whether he is to be turned adrift without any provision at all, which his circumstances can very ill bear. Mr. Pelham knew the King's aversion from the applicant, and with no less kindness than prudence, forbore to raise hopes, of the gratification of which he could not feel confident. But he was fully alive to the extreme hardship of the circumstances: he assured Lord Harrington of his own good will; talked of time and chance, the usual bosom counsellors of the unfortunate; and expressed himself to the Duke of Newcastle in terms which strongly evidence his commiseration—"in short, it is a melancholy sight to see him." The Duke in reply denies the hardship of Lord Harrington's removal, which he shows is the common course of official routine; but adds that he should very deeply regret any proceedings which might shock him. He then offers to apply to the King, although he does not know how it will be re-



ceived, for a pension of £1500 or £2000 a year for him, he being already in possession, for a term of years, of one of £2500. Mr. Pelham, in return, suggests another provision.

“ ‘ I must now give you an account of a conversation I had yesterday with Lord Harrington. He came to me full of anxiety and trouble. He has at last found out that he is not long to continue in the post he now enjoys. He fears a sudden stroke, and thinks that if he is removed before any thing else is allotted to him, he shall be left without any thing at all ! I did not, nor ever have denied to him, that I thought the Duke of Dorset would be his successor, and that I concluded the time would not be long before his fate would be determined. He then asked me if I thought he should succeed Dorset ? I told him, by what I saw of the king before he left England, I feared it much. He then said, “ If the king do not care to see me, why cannot Lord Gower be President, and I succeed him as Lord Privy Seal ? ” My answer was, Gower was so broke in spirit and constitution, I feared his ability of going through that office, and really thought he would not undertake it. “ Why, then,” says he, “ what is it I am to expect ? I desire you will write to the Duke of Newcastle ; tell him I desire to know my fate, and that I hope the king will not reduce an old servant to want, for no fault he is sensible to have committed.” He asked me whether he had offended the king in any thing he had done as Lord-Lieutenant. I told him I knew of nothing ; that perhaps he might have recommended people, now and then, whom the king did not like, but that I thought that did not go far. I owned sincerely to him, that I took the old affair \* to be the sore which I never saw healed, with regard to him, since the thing happened. He said he believed that was the case ; but then, sure those for whom he suffered, would think themselves obliged in honour to stand a little by him, who had lost his all by standing firmly by them. I saw what and whom he meant. I told him, therefore, he was sensible of my friendship, and that I could assure him you were as desirous of accommodating him as I could be.

“ ‘ I promised to write to you by this post, and told him I would communicate your answer as soon as I received it. I find the world begins to compassionate him ; and it is talked about as if we were, in honour, obliged to do our best for him, since he suffered for standing so thoroughly by us. I have been thinking, though I never mentioned it to him, whether the old story of General of the Marines might not do. His friends, I have reason to believe, will be satisfied with that, though I dare say he himself will not be pleased. I should not, according to my principles, recommend a farther expense on that head of service ; but when I consider he will not last long, and that the opposition would probably be stopped from attacking him, I had rather venture that reproach than the other, of suffering a man to drop, for an offence which we drew him into, and in which we were as much concerned as he. I wish, dear brother, you would think of this. You may be assured I

\* “ The refusal of Lord Harrington to desert the Pelhams in 1746, when the King wished to form a new administration.”

will do the best I can to make him easy; but if nothing is done for him, or proposed to be done, I will not attempt so vain a thing as to try at excuses; for when a man is sorely hurt, that rather irritates than assuages his resentments. At present he is calm, but very anxious as to his fate.'"—vol. ii. pp. 380, 381.

And such was also Lord Hardwicke's wish.

" 'Lord Harrington desired a private conference with me yesterday, which, not having happened for several years, surprised me. I met him, and must own some part of it was a moving scene. His whole business was upon his own subject, in which he related what he had heard, of his being to be removed from his present office as soon as the king returned, which he took for granted to be resolved upon. He hoped that after so long service he was not to be left upon the pavement, without any provision; that his circumstances were so very moderate, that it would reduce him to *great* inconvenience. And here he burst into tears, and could not go on. He could not recollect that he had ever given the king any offence, but by being first in resigning in February, 1745-6, which, he said, was a measure in conjunction with us all. He reclaimed your Grace's friendship, which he hoped he had never forfeited; for as to any difference of opinion on political measures at a particular time, he relied on your candour not to think that any forfeiture of it, and therefore hoped for your powerful interposition and assistance, that if he was to lose the Lieutenancy of Ireland, he might at the same time be provided for in some other way. I told his Lordship I pretended to no power, but had no scruple to declare my real opinion, as well as wish, that he should be honourably provided for. That I had good reason to think it was also your Grace's opinion, and promised to write to you, as I am now doing. He desired me to let Mr. Pelham know that he had spoken to me, which I did, and need not tell your Grace that he is strongly in that way of thinking. He is for making my Lord, General of Marines, as Peterborough and Stair were. He says he can, in this instance, stand the doing of it, and thinks the king may be brought to give way to it, as it will cost his Majesty neither place nor pension. I cannot help concurring with your brother in this idea, and also in thinking, that if his Majesty's displeasure is supposed to be founded on the resignation, which was a common measure, then thought right even for the king's service, it will be a reproach to those to whom Lord Harrington then adhered, to leave him quite unprovided and destitute. Be so good, my Lord, to enable me to say some words of comfort to him as soon as you can.'"—vol. ii. pp. 382—383.

Two more notices of this ill-used Nobleman occur, and both of them show that the Pelhams had his advancement at heart. The first is from the Duke of Newcastle.

" 'If the king should ask what I think about Lord Harrington's being General of the Marines, you may with truth say, that if his Majesty is determined to do nothing else for him, I would rather stand the reproach of having given my consent to that measure, than see an old servant of the king's, in the decline of life, turned adrift for no public misconduct,

that I know of, and for no private one that you and I can decently find fault with.'—vol. ii. p. 394.

The next from his Brother.

“ ‘ I have done well with Harrington as far as relates to yourself, but have been very cautious of leading him into false hopes. I cannot but repeat my wishes that he may not be totally forgot; and believe me, dear brother, when we cannot satisfy people in essentials, there is a great deal in treating their ill fortunes with decency and concern.’ ”—vol. ii. p. 396.

We could willingly be spared the task of reciting the conclusion of this painful history; but the disgrace which it brings with it belongs not to the Pelhams, but to George II., who appears to have attained an unenviable pre-eminence in committing the most ungracious actions possible in the most ungracious possible manner.

“ The post of General of Marines became vacant by the death of Lord Stair, and Mr. Pelham entertained a hope that this appointment, which was of no official consequence, might be obtained for his noble friend. The Duke of Newcastle requested it from the king, but was answered by an unqualified refusal. Among other angry expressions, his Majesty observed, that the generalship of Marines was to be the reward of all who flew in his face; that this was the case with Lord Stair; and when the Duke endeavoured to soothe him, he said, ‘ I will do nothing; I will not be troubled about it. Lord Harrington deserves nothing, and shall have nothing. As to the generalship of Marines, he shall not have it if I can hinder it.’ In reply to this information, Mr. Pelham writes, October 16th, 1750, ‘ Your letter about Lord Harrington is as cruel and melancholy as can be. I have done saying any thing more on the subject. I shall write to the poor man, and tell him the truth, leaving out the coarse expressions. You may depend upon my saying every thing from you that I possibly can. I fear this measure will do the king no service. His Majesty is, however, the best judge of his own actions, and I know my duty and situation too well to interfere any more.’ ”

“ From this time no farther attempt was made to overcome the repugnance of the king. Soon afterwards Lord Harrington returned from the government of Ireland, but was disappointed in his hope of obtaining an official situation; and the Duke of Dorset was declared Lord-Lientenant, on the 6th of December, by his Majesty in Council.”—vol. ii. pp. 134, 135.

The egregious difficulties with which the Pelhams had to contend in consequence of the German predilections of their master, may be strikingly shown by a single occurrence mentioned incidentally in one of the Duke of Newcastle's Letters. However great were the interests at stake, whatever were the objects of his Ministers, or the methods by which they purposed to compass them, the King, if possible, always planned some *diversion* to-

wards a Hanoverian job. In the summer of 1732, when negotiations for securing the Imperial Crown in the Austrian family, by obtaining the election of the Archduke Joseph as King of the Romans, had been already two years in progress, it appeared that the vote of the Elector Palatine might be gained by the administration of that most powerful argument with the Germanic Body, the payment of 1,200,000 florins. It little matters what title was imposed upon the bribe:—whether subsidy, indemnification, satisfaction or composition, on the authority of Vespasian,

“By any other name it smells as sweet.”

Of this sum, after much quibbling, the Court of Vienna agreed to advance 500,000 florins, and the remainder was to be made up by the Maritime powers. As usual in pecuniary politics, the difference between the two equal moieties, or 200,000 florins, was to proceed from the English Treasury. The Duke of Newcastle strongly urged the necessity of consenting to this arrangement, and wrote to Mr. Pelham in terms of the most earnest entreaty:

“If you do not send a thorough strong opinion for making up whatever shall be wanting of the 700,000 florins, I shall be much disappointed, and my credit and reputation greatly disgraced; but what is of much more consequence, the honour of the King our master, and the reputation of England reduced extremely low in every court of Europe, and we shall soon become a province of France.”

Mr. Pelham, notwithstanding his anxiety to save the public money, and his aversion from all interference with foreign politics, was impressed by these representations, and agreed to the payment, much, as it appeared, to the satisfaction of the King. On meeting the Duke of Newcastle at the hunt on the morning after the arrival of Mr. Pelham's Letter, his Majesty showed marks of extreme joy and satisfaction, distinguished his Minister by extraordinary signs of graciousness and favour, and what seems to have been a most unusual occurrence, absolutely “kept his good humour the whole day;” nay, in the evening, when the Duke had parted from him, he was assured by MM. Grosvoight and Steinberg, who had been in attendance, that the King “remained in the highest spirits; thought now the thing would do; asked them their opinion, and seemed as happy and as well pleased as it was possible for man to be.” The Duke accordingly drew up the necessary instructions, and presented them on the following morning. But, alas!

ἔσπεριον φιλέουσιν ἀτὶρ στυγέουσιν ἔφον,

what must have been his astonishment at his reception!

“To my great surprise, when I produced the sketch, his Majesty fell

into the strongest declarations against the making up of the 700,000 florins that ever I heard; and seemed quite to have forgot the letters from England, which he was so much pleased with the day before. I soon found the real reason was, that he had a mind to protract this negotiation, in order to have a pretence for staying longer here, perhaps until near Christmas, and that has been confirmed since by Lady Yarmouth. He began by saying, that he would not fling away the money of England so; or to that purpose; that *I might be in haste, but that he was not*; that it was the same thing to him if the answer came in a fortnight or three weeks; that *I would give a million for this object, but that he had it not so much at heart*. I showed him that the article about the money was exactly agreeable to the paragraph in your letter, which I read over to him; that, as to the object, I believed one of that importance had never been so cheaply purchased. I observed that the time expired at the end of the four weeks; and then he had recourse to M. de St. Contest, who, he said, did not think that time sufficient. In short, so altered a man was never seen. Nothing was right. His steadiness had done wonders; the Emperor might pay the whole, and the Elector Palatine would accept less. The whole calculated for delay. So that this object is to be risked, in order to give his Majesty some pretence to do so unpopular a thing as to leave his kingdoms in the month of March, and not to return to them till the month of December, and that just before the choice of a new parliament, and when he sees opposition stirring from every quarter of the kingdom. This is the whole secret; this Lady Yarmouth has confirmed to me, as I said; and for this will he risk every thing.'—vol. ii. p. 448.

Nor was this all. Without the privity of his Ministers, the King, ever greedy of private advantage, had been negotiating with the Court of Vienna for some fief or expectation for himself; thus furnishing an additional reason for a rupture of the negotiation at the very time at which his English Government had made enormous sacrifices to forward it. Still more, he wished to apply the money which was granted him for the express purpose of meeting the demands of the Elector Palatine, to subsidize Russia for the protection of his darling Hanover. The transaction, on his own representation, was to be no other than a downright piece of swindling. The Duke writes to his Brother as follows:—

“ ‘ On my return hither, the Grosvoight acquainted me with what the King had said to M. Steinberg and him relating to the 700,000 florins, supposed to be paid by us. His Majesty was pleased to talk very strongly against it; and when M. de Munchausen tenderly (I dare say very tenderly) offered to say one word in support of it, the King told them that it was the opinion of a fool or a madman; and this in the presence of M. Steinberg. His Majesty then told them both, that he could not open himself to me upon the subject; that he would do to them; “ that his true reason for saving the money to the nation, was in order to get a subsidy of £40,000 per annum for Russia; that he would

*cajole* and *manage* Mr. Pelham, and that he should get his consent to it." This you may depend upon is *fact*."—vol. ii. p. 455.

This "little low game," these "low personal views," as the Brothers separately and very justly characterize them, were resisted with becoming firmness. The Duke says, "His Majesty did very right in not trusting me with his true reason against giving the money for the election. I should certainly have told him that no expence could be justified, or be practicable, if this were neglected." Mr. Pelham received the information with calmness and dignity.

"I sent your letter to Lord Chancellor, who had received a copy of it from you. He therefore is *au fait* of the whole from yourself. I have once seen Mr. Stone, and talked of it to him, as you permitted me, and as I thought you wished I should. We all agree in the same construction of what you sent us, and I believe they are satisfied, as I hope you are, that I am not easily cajoled. Where I have yielded, as I have often told you, has been where you were concerned, and where the part I must have taken, if I had not yielded, would have been more dangerous than the thing itself. This is what I think you never can be concerned in, and if you are not, I do not mind my neighbour,\* who is undoubtedly at the bottom of these politics. If you remember, he almost told me so, when I asked him a question in the King's antichamber, to which he gave me a frank answer, that you did not then approve of his doing.

"You know how far I have gone, and why I have done so; you know also that I can go no farther, without any new matter arises to make it necessary; and how little probable it is that should arise, you also know. I therefore conclude you are firm; and if you are so, depend upon it I shall not swerve."—vol. ii. p. 463.

Lord Hardwicke expressed himself on the same subject very feelingly, and yet with great prudence.

"Mr. Brown's diligence sent me the honour of your Grace's letter of the 3rd last night, together with copies of two to your brother. I perceive by them that the great point of the election, and all other foreign affairs, remain just in the same situation as when your Grace wrote last; except that there is a return of better humour, and a better disposition to come into the only means that can bring about the end we wish than appeared before. I never doubted but this affair would happen; though I find we were all out, in our conjectures about that strange sally; and yet I am not quite sure, whether we have the truth yet; or whether what has been given out about Russia, is not a colour thought of since. But this speculation is immaterial. The *manner* of declaring it, and the plan of *separate cajolerie*, which is avowed by it, are the essential interesting parts. Indeed the last is the essential one; for, as to *the words* made use of, though they are to the last degree shocking, and give me real pain to read them, yet they are only the effects of heat and passion,

\* "Lord Granville, who lived next door to Mr. Pelham, in Arlington Street."



and certain ill humours, to which I do not care to give the true name, and what, in the like temper, would have been said of any body that ever was about *him*. They are therefore to be neglected; but, at the same time, to be known to as few persons as possible; not *merely* for the sake of the persons who have made the discovery. As to the avowal of *cajoling and managing Mr. P—*, your Grace is certainly right in communicating it to him in the confidence you have done. 'The use you made of it is also right; and I think it will have a good effect.'—vol. ii. p. 457.

It is refreshing to turn from these petty tricks and unbecoming meannesses to the open, upright and liberal qualities which formed the basis of Mr. Pelham's character. Without claiming for him that loftiness of mind, the subsequent exhibition of which, during a long series of years, in the administration of both the Pitts, has made us of succeeding days, for a time, almost believe that great intellect must be a Ministerial inheritance; we find in him a sound though not a showy understanding, a clearer insight into domestic policy than was possessed by any of his contemporaries, considerable Parliamentary knowledge, steady attention to business, frankness and candour, discretion and perseverance. Above all, there was a placability in his temper which made him the bond and cement of administrations composed of very discordant materials; and which soothed, moderated and corrected the ever-wakeful jealousy of his more ambitious and less consistent brother. Free from all pride, he won the general affection of his colleagues, who were for the most part at variance with each other, and commanded the respect and the good-will of a Prince proverbial for irritability and want of self-command. No lover of money, he was a frugal steward to the Public: he reduced the interest of the national debt; and, as the libeller to whom we have so frequently alluded has been compelled to admit, "lived without abusing his power, and died poor." In the fulfilment of private duties few men appear to have been more exemplary, nor to have obtained their present reward more largely, in the love of those with whom he was connected. Glover, indeed, in his second-rate and self-important Memoirs, wherein he abundantly mismatches praise and censure, and bespatters those of whom he had little more knowledge than that of their names, with black or white, as it comes first to hand—Glover has ventured upon a charge which, if it had been true, Horace Walpole *must* have known, and certainly would not have forgotten; that Mr. Pelham was "a professed gamester," and that "even when Minister he divided his time to the last between his office and the club of gamesters at White's." Horace Walpole, both from birth and taste, possessed an intimate access to polite society, to which, from lack of each, the *parvenu* Glover was a stranger; for the back stairs of



Leicester House were not the surest approach to the drawing-rooms of St. James's Square. But, in addition to the silence of Horace Walpole, we have, in contradiction to Glover's slander, the direct assertion of Lord Chesterfield. Mr. Pelham, as that noble writer tells us, was a man of many domestic virtues and of no vices. Such indeed is the judgment which might be formed from those portions of his confidential and unreserved correspondence, through which we obtain glimpses of his manners at home. They breathe a gentle and affectionate spirit; and they convey a pleasing assurance, which indeed has been corroborated by many other bright instances in our History, that private happiness, *if it be to the taste of the individual*, need not be abandoned on account of the attainment of public eminence. "Esher" is not the only spot which affords "a peaceful grove" to the jaded statesman, if his wishes are bent upon tranquillity. We have seldom met with a trifling incident which speaks more fully for habitual kindness than the following, which Mr. Coxe has recorded of Mr. Pelham.

"A traditional anecdote, preserved in the family, and communicated by the present Duke of Newcastle, will afford a pleasing instance of the easy and kind condescension with which Mr. Pelham behaved to his domestics. He had sent for his coachman to give him some orders: whilst he was speaking, the man suddenly drew out his watch, and glancing a look at it, abruptly broke off the conversation, by exclaiming, "Sir, it is my time, and I must go and drive *my* children in the carriage." "Richard," said Mr. Pelham, "the *time* may be yours, the carriage may be yours, and so may the horses and other things; but, my good Richard, do let the children be my own."—vol. ii. p. 304.

Little remains to be added; for we need not dwell upon well-known points of History. Mr. Pelham died on the 6th of March, 1754; and with his decease the subject-matter of these volumes terminates. He left no male issue; nor was there any from his brother, the Duke. The Dukedom of Newcastle-under-line was obtained by a new patent, with remainder to Henry, Earl of Lincoln, a nephew, who had married Catharine, a daughter of the Premier, and in that line the name and honours of the family are still continued.

ART. III.—*Prolegomena specialia, recognovit Dathianisque et Variorum Notis suas immiscuit* Franciscus Wrangham, A. M., S. R. S. Clevelandiae Archidiaconus. Two Vols. 8vo. Cambridge. 1828.

WE sincerely congratulate Mr. Wrangham and the public on the publication of this fourth and splendid edition of the Prolego-

mena to the London Polyglot Bible. A work more remarkable for judgment and learning certainly has not appeared since the revival of literature; and perhaps we may as confidently affirm that one of greater value to the cause of biblical knowledge is not likely soon to supersede it. To illustrate and bring forward works of this description can never be out of place; but, at a time like the present, when biblical literature is manifestly advancing, and when speculative, if not useless and unsound, notions of divinity seem also to be making some progress among us, such a boon cannot but be considered as peculiarly valuable. We do not mean to affirm, however, that this work is in every respect perfect, but we do that it exhibits a scholar-like and masterly treatise on the most important subjects connected with scriptural learning, and this written with a candour and perspicuity worthy of the character of a Christian and divine, and with an elegance and precision seldom equalled. It is further worthy of remark, that notwithstanding the advances made in later times, both in oriental learning and in the knowledge of facts connected with the state of the Hebrew text, the work of Walton has lost none of its value. Its philology, no less than its criticism, exhibits no instances of decay; and, like the cause which it was its author's object to advance, becomes by its age only more venerable and convincing.

As Mr. Wrangham has considerably enriched this edition with notes written either by himself or his colleagues, it will not be necessary here to say much on those subjects which appear to have made some progress since the times of Bishop Walton. We shall be brief therefore, offering a few remarks only on subjects of a purely philological nature, connected with the first Prolegomenon or Preface of Walton, with the view of establishing what has just been said on the value of this work. Since the times of our author, as it is well known, our intercourse with the East has been greatly facilitated; and the consequence has been some new languages, and a considerable number of books unknown to him, have been imported to Europe. Hence, as it might be expected, new opinions on the origin and nature of languages, as well as on the histories of nations, have been broached in no small numbers; and in some instances the biblical accounts of these matters, and with them the statements of Walton and others, have been fearlessly questioned, discussed, and condemned; because, as it has been supposed and indeed asserted, "Many have run to and fro, and knowledge has been increased." The intellectual march, which had only then commenced, and was proceeding with "fainting steps and slow," now, like Virgil's galloping horse, "*Quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit*

*ungula campum.*" The light, which these our pious forefathers "saw through a glass darkly," has, forsooth, commenced to pour its floods of glory about us, to such a degree that we may now be said to have arrived at a maturity in every thing connected with philology and divinity, at least, which the world has never before witnessed. But let us see how far these notions are borne out: and our first remarks shall be on a work highly spoken of in this respect; we mean the *Philological Researches* of Mr. Vans Kennedy.

It was customary with the best writers of Walton's times, and indeed has been with some well-informed persons since, to suppose that, as the Bible is manifestly the oldest, and certainly not the least credible, book in existence, the accounts which it gives of the origin of man and of nations, as well as of languages, are probably the true ones. Mr. Vans Kennedy, however, to whom a few others of the same class of writers may be added, thinks differently. One of these we formerly noticed at some length:\* we now proceed to give a few instances of the reasoning of our later writer.

"Since so many learned men," says Mr. Kennedy in his introductory remarks (p. 10), "have maintained and still maintain that Hebrew is the parent of all languages, it becomes necessary to discuss at some length the correctness of an opinion which is in complete opposition to the conclusions which I have been led to form. This opinion, however," adds he, "might be ascribed to *ignorance* or an *imperfect knowledge of oriental languages*, and thus any refutation of it might appear superfluous. But as these writers understood Greek, and still persisted in deriving the most copious of all tongues from one the most scanty and imperfect, some inquiry whether any affinity can possibly exist between Hebrew and other languages appeared indispensable."

It may be doubted, however, whether the Scaligers, Bochart, Walton, Grotius, Golius, Pococke, Hyde, Selden, Castell,† &c. were not quite as profoundly learned in the oriental languages as Mr. Kennedy, if we except the Sanscrit, which was not then known in Europe, and of which, it need not be doubted, Mr. Kennedy's knowledge is very superficial. But let us see on what grounds Mr. Kennedy's reasons stand.

\* *British Critic* for January, 1826.

† Mr. Kennedy indeed has deigned to notice some of these worthies in the words of a man congenial in spirit with his own. His words are these (Preface, p. ix.):—"The justness of the following observations of Lord Bolingbroke can scarcely be contested:—'A man must be as indifferent as I am to common censure or approbation, to avow a thorough contempt for the whole business of these learned lives; for all the researches into antiquity, for all the systems of chronology and history that we owe to the immense labours of a Scaliger, a Bochart, a Petavius, an Usher, and even a Marsham, &c.' " No doubt, when the cause of error is to be advocated, names and works like theirs must be made truly contemptible! This is doubtless the shortest and most convenient way of proceeding.

In the first place, then, he takes Genesis, chap. xi. v. 1. 6, 7. 9, and proceeds to show from them that the primitive language of mankind must, according to the obvious meaning of these verses, have been abolished at the confusion there said to have taken place at the Tower of Babel.

But, by some fatality or other, Mr. Kennedy has forgotten to prove that the *confusion* and *destruction* of a language are actually one and the same thing. The ignoramuses of Walton's times, however, seem to have thought that a confusion might have taken place in language on this remarkable occasion, and that the primitive tongue may still have survived; and they further thought that if the Bible is a history of real events, there was great reason to believe that the Hebrew is that primitive language. Let us now examine a few of Mr. Kennedy's reasons for objecting.

One of his favourite ones is, the extreme *scantiness* and *poverty*, as he is perpetually insisting, of the Hebrew language, when compared with the Sanscrit or Greek. On some occasions too, he tells us, and this for the purpose of making good these assertions, that he has carefully examined the Lexicons of Buxtorf and Castell. From all this, one would suppose that Mr. Kennedy has actually ascertained the number of roots in these several languages, and, therefore, that no objection whatever can be offered to his statements. Mr. Kennedy, however, has made no such computation. These points he leaves to be determined by others who may be more practical and less theoretic: and the fact is, the Hebrew language, as found in one book, the Bible alone, contains about five hundred primitive words more than either the Greek or the Sanscrit! The "irremediable poverty" of the Hebrew, therefore, is, after all, much richer than either of Mr. Kennedy's opulent favourites. And the probability is, that if we had as many books written in pure Hebrew, and transmitted to us from the times of the Theocracy, as we possess in the Arabic, we should have been able to show a language as much more copious than either the Greek or Sanscrit, as the Arabic now confessedly is.

Mr. Kennedy, however, has other *philosophical* objections, applying to both these languages. One is, the simplicity and unvarying character of their structure. "Its grammatical structure (*i. e.* of the Arabic) is rude and imperfect."—(p. 26.) "The very genius of the Arabic language consists in its rudeness and imperfection; for it was sedulously cultivated for five hundred years, and yet not the slightest change was effected in its general character," (p. 29.) "In the Arabic the root is the third person singular of the preterite of the verb, and

the derivations from it are conducted in so *simple* and *perspicuous* a manner, *that their relation to the root becomes at once obvious.*" (*Ib.* p. 31.) "It is obvious, that this last method must have condemned the language so formed to *irremediable poverty*:" (and page 32.)—"The same remarks apply to the Hebrew, which, both in its words and its grammatical structure, bears so intimate an affinity to Arabic." To all this, it may perhaps be said, that it may possibly appear problematical to some, how the regularity of any language can be pleaded in order to prove its poverty, unless indeed, there be something in the joke sometimes cracked at the expense of the Cambridge mathematicians, that the length, breadth, &c. of a ship being given, the captain's name may be found, and *vice versâ*. Yet it may be doubted whether Mr. Kennedy is a mathematician, although he presumes, that the formation of a language being given, he can determine its extent.

Another objection is, and this applies to the Arabic alone, that, allowing its words to be many, yet the ideas presented can be but few, and we are told, (p. 27,) "A number of words, when they are merely synonymes for one and the same idea, as in Arabic, is the most convincing proof of the barrenness of a language." And, strange to say, four or five lines lower down we are told: "The existence, however, of synonymes in the Arabic language, at least to any extent, is very questionable!" It really is difficult to determine how to deal with such writers as Mr. Kennedy. He first thinks that this language must necessarily be barren, because it is regular: then, that it cannot be copious, because the ideas of the people speaking it must have been few, owing to their not having travelled, &c.; but, supposing it to be copious, then the words forming this copiousness must be *synonymous*, and lastly, in fact, few or no such synonymes do exist in the Arabic.

In another place we are told (p. 28), that it cannot be precise, because, for instance, it has only two tenses. "Two additional past tenses," it is added, "may, indeed, be formed by the assistance of the substantive verb; but the verb itself still remains deficient in a *present and future tense*, and in a conjunctive, potential, and optative mood, &c. And again, *ib.* "It is with the utmost difficulty that it can be determined what the word is which is actually intended. ضربت (zrbt), for instance, may be the first person, the second person masculine or feminine, and the third person feminine, of the preterite of the active or passive voice, or it may be a form of the infinitive of the verb ضرب, or it may be a noun, according as the short vowels may be applied, &c." This, it may be answered, may according to Mr. Kennedy's notions

be very fine philosophy: according to ours, however, it is extremely questionable. We happen to know, perhaps, as well as Mr. Kennedy does, how the tenses of an Arabic verb are formed, and perhaps have read quite as much of the language as he has, whether in print or in manuscript; and yet, as far as our experience goes, none of these theoretical difficulties ever gave us much pain. But would it not have been as well, if Mr. Kennedy had produced some of these inexplicable and ambiguous passages? This would have afforded good proof, if such is really to be found. That such passages are not to be found in Arabic, no one, who knows anything of the matter, will deny: but they exist in numbers no greater than they do both in Greek and Sanscrit, and, it may be, in some of our own writers. This then, is proof which Mr. Kennedy ought to have made out, had it been in his power to do so: and had it not, he was not the person to make the assertions alluded to. But Mr. Kennedy is not, we presume qualified for this. The gentleman who will tell us, that the substantive verb (كان) has not a present or future tense; and that ضربت (zrbt) may be mistaken for a noun, which, as such, must be written ضربة, is, we think, not very likely to find the ambiguous examples in Arabic, which he has no doubt, must so extensively exist. No; we affirm, that the difficulties Mr. Kennedy has met with in these respects have arisen purely from his want of knowledge, and not from any ambiguity inherent in the language.

Mr. Kennedy's next objection, and the last we shall notice on this subject is to "the interminable commentaries on the Koran and the traditions; voluminous but subtle disquisitions on Arabic grammar, ponderous works on jurisprudence with still more ponderous glosses, several philosophical works, some meagre histories and a few monotonous collections of poetry." (p. 29.) It would, we believe, be thought too much in a Reviewer, to pronounce thus roundly on any work, which he had never read: and, we have no doubt Mr. Kennedy would heavily complain were we to deal so with his elaborate and favourite production, yet we fear, it is the truth that Mr. Kennedy has never yet read any one of the volumes thus stigmatized. The truth is, and this the Literati of Germany and France, no less than the great men of Walton's times, have confessed, a thorough knowledge of the Arabic grammar can be acquired in no other way, than by reading their own grammars and scholiasts, however tedious and unnecessary these may appear to Mr. Kennedy. Neither can a perfect knowledge of their laws, religion, history, &c. be obtained, except by reading their own books, however meagre, ponderous, or the like, they may appear,



The same, perhaps, may be said of every people under the sun; unless, indeed, we can, like Mr. Kennedy, determine all this by arguments *à priori*, which we are disposed to doubt. But, if the Arabs, have so great a number of works on history, philosophy, poetry, religion, &c. and their language has preserved itself from the very highest antiquity in the greatest possible purity; and is, moreover formed on the simplest principles, all of which Mr. Kennedy fully allows, we should think, with every deference to his superior sagacity, that this language presents an ample and valuable field for researches in philology, history, &c. whatever he may think to the contrary.

With reference to the Sanscrit, Mr. Kennedy (p. 30.) loudly objects to the common notion of the grammarians, viz. that this language is formed from simple roots like the Arabic. But why should Mr. Kennedy object to this in the Sanscrit, while it is so universally acknowledged with respect to the Greek? We may further ask Mr. Kennedy, does he know of any language on the face of the whole earth otherwise constructed? If he does, he can, of course, name it; but this we think, he cannot do. All languages, it should seem, are formed very much on the same general principles, *i. e.* all have simple words, and formed upon these, are their augmented ones, although the augmentation may not always be made either by the same particles or in the same way. And, the truth seems to be, that if we could always determine these laws with as much ease, as we can those which prevail in the Arabic and Hebrew, all languages would be equally simple and regular. The Sanscrit, as it now stands developed in the grammar, is subjected to endless rules, which again are confronted with as many exceptions. These, Mr. Forster says, amount to thousands, and perhaps to this circumstance alone may be ascribed all the variety, and, indeed, the copiousness with which Mr. Kennedy is so much charmed in the Sanscrit. But may it not be true, that all this hash of rules and exceptions, has rather sprung from the ignorance of the grammarians, than from the real character of the language, and that Mr. Kennedy has been betrayed into his rapturous eulogies of it, rather by the operation of the principle that "*Omne ignotum pro magnifico est*," than by any beauty inherent in it, or advantage likely to accrue from its study. This is certainly our impression on this subject, and we regret that it is so greatly at variance with the notions of Mr. Kennedy.

On several occasions we find the Hebrew language designated in this work as the language of Abraham, (p. 17, &c.) and then arguments are framed to show, that the language of Abraham could



never have prevailed to any considerable extent out of the countries in which he lived: and further, that even in Canaan, the language must have been fixed before he left Ur of the Chaldees. But, who, except Mr. Kennedy, has ever thought of such a position as this? No one, as far as we are informed, has ever attempted to show, that Hebrew was the native language of Abraham. On the contrary, as he came out of Chaldea, the probability is, that it was Chaldean. That Abraham found the Hebrew language in Canaan, is extremely probable, which the name Melchisedeck alone (*King of Righteousness*, מלכיצדק) is perhaps, sufficient to justify; and if so, then this language may have prevailed there and in some of the adjacent states from time immemorial, even from that of Ham the Father of Canaan. Mr. Kennedy might therefore have spared himself the trouble of refuting what no one has ever advanced; or in other words, of being at the trouble of forming a new creation, in order to have the pleasure of destroying it.

It cannot be necessary, we are sure, to follow Mr. Kennedy through such reveries as these—and we shall forbear to do so. He has not been satisfied, however, in endeavouring to destroy all philological credit which might be attached to the writings of Moses—and which he seems to think he has effectually done—but he has actually set about to show, not only that objections may be offered to the authenticity of the Bible, either in whole or in part, as others have done, but that the slightest examination of it shows that it answers very imperfectly the purposes of history (p. 12.) Now let us see how this point is made out. In page 13 we have Exod. xii. 40, cited: “Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years. And it came to pass at the end of the 430 years, even the selfsame day, it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from . . . Egypt.” Mr. Kennedy’s remark is—“I cannot, therefore, discover on what grounds the received system of chronology assumes that the bondage in Egypt lasted only 215 years.” And then we have Gen. xv. 13. and Acts, vii. 6. cited in confirmation of Mr. Kennedy’s view of the subject. We remark, if Mr. Kennedy had given himself the trouble to look into Usher, or almost any Scripture chronology, he would have seen why 215 years have been taken as the limit of time for the residence of the Israelites in Egypt: besides, he would have also probably learned, that the first passage cited by him does not state that the Israelites sojourned in Egypt 430 years; but only that the period of their whole sojourning, up to that of their leaving Egypt, was 430 years. Mr. Kennedy, therefore, seems in this, as in a preceding

instance, to have mistaken his text; and, being thus situated, he has had no doubt that the chronologers must all, up to his time, have been quite in the dark. After this happy effort, he actually sets about correcting Moses; for, although the chronologers have blundered, the truth is Moses himself, no less than the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, must have done the same thing—and here follows the proof. “Jacob begets Levi at 35 years of age; Levi begets Kohath at 30; Kohath begets Amran (Amram) at 35; Amran begets Moses at 40.” The sum of these ages is 140. Then, after making certain deductions, it is concluded—“the period of the Hebrews’ bondage in Egypt will have lasted only 104 years!” Every one will at once suppose that Mr. Kennedy has taken all the numbers just given from the Bible itself, and thence to have drawn his conclusions—but “there’s no such thing.” They are the pure creations of Mr. Kennedy’s own brain; and the truth is, he has been contending with a giant of his own creation! At the foot of the page we have a note with some numbers taken from Eusebius; but as these are much larger than those of Mr. Kennedy, he despatches them with, “it is impossible to admit (them), because (they are) *evidently inconsistent with the common course of nature*.” And, after all, Moses is wrong, because Mr. Kennedy is sure that he is so! After these specimens of Mr. Kennedy’s mode of reasoning, no one will be surprised at finding him concluding anything and everything that may happen to suit his fancy. A great Sانسrit dynasty at Babylon, unsupported by history or even the poorest probability, will be nothing after such beginnings as these! and such we actually find in Mr. Kennedy’s work. It is not our intention, however, to follow Mr. Kennedy through all these vagaries. We believe we have done enough in the exposure we have made of the fallacious principles on which his work is conducted, which we hope will save our younger friends, not only the labour of wading through such a mass of chaotic and disjointed materials, but the pernicious taint of infidelity and disbelief of the truth which it is calculated to inspire. Let us now betake ourselves to different matter.

Our first prolegomenon, on the origin and nature of languages, &c., is conducted, as already remarked, with particular regard to the declarations contained in the Bible. In this branch of the subject, however, Walton found a most acute and learned opponent in the celebrated Richard Simon; and as this work often falls into the hands of young Theologians, and has already been productive of incalculable injury to the cause of truth in Europe, it will not perhaps be out of place here to examine some of his arguments.

Walton's first position is, that man must originally have been endued as well with speech as with reason :

“ Primo, statuendum est, hominem ab initio, ut ratione, sic etiam et oratione sive loquelâ, fuisse præditum : unde Hebræi hominem vocant חַי מְדַבֵּר *animal loquens*, et Græci ζῷον λογικόν et πολιτικόν. . . . Nam, sine hoc sermocinandi instrumento ; non esset animal politicum sive sociale.”  
--sec. 2.

Père Simon answers—

“ Les preuves qu'il rapporte d'abord pour montrer que l'homme est né aussi-bien avec la parole qu'avec la raison, ne sont point concluantes. Car ce n'est pas une bonne preuve, de dire que le premier homme est né avec la parole, parce qu'il est né pour la société ; il suffit que Dieu ait donné aux hommes tout ce qui est nécessaire pour inventer les langues.”

Now, without attempting to determine what it was sufficient or not for the Almighty to do, either on this or any other occasion, we certainly find immediately after the account of our first parents' creation, that “ God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it ; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.”—Gen. i. 28. And again, chap. ii. v. 17, they are forbidden to eat of a certain tree on pain of death ; and in the same chapter, v. 20, we find Adam gave names to both the beasts and the birds. It is true indeed, as some have remarked, we are not informed what time may have passed between the period of their creation, and the occurrence of these particulars ; but in the first passage at least this is mentioned as having taken place immediately : nor can we see any possible reason, unless it be to serve an hypothesis, why any interval should be supposed to have elapsed, especially as these declarations not only regarded their destiny, but the very means on which they were to subsist, (v. 29.) “ Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed ; to you it shall be for meat.” These circumstances, one would think, are sufficient to restrict this first address to the very period at which man was at liberty to do those acts, which are necessary for the sustenance of life. But imagine fifty or a hundred years of his life to have elapsed, and this precept will immediately appear to be out of place. The learned Father of the Oratory, however, goes much farther :

“ Il ne s'ensuit pas aussi (dit-il) que l'homme ait dû parler d'abord qu'il est né, parce qu'il a été créé à la ressemblance de Dieu : au-contraindre, il seroit bien plus semblable à Dieu, s'il pouvoit exprimer ses conceptions, et entendre celle des autres par d'autres voyes que par la parole,

de la même manière que les anges, qui ne sont pas moins semblables à Dieu, bien qu'ils ne parlent point.\*"

We answer—not to insist on the unsuitableness of reasoning of this kind on a subject which must be determined by authority alone, there is a great deal here taken for granted which neither Father Simon nor any other man can prove under any circumstances; but which, if the Scriptures may be relied on, taking them in their obvious and natural acceptation, must be palpably false. Whatever may be said of the Deity abstractedly, certain it is that Scripture attributes speech to him—and, what Père Simon thinks would be incredible, even the parts and the passions of men. When, for example, we read of the Captain of Israel appearing to Joshua, he stood with a sword drawn in his hand;† and on this occasion was he worshipped by Joshua. In like manner the Divine appearance which was seen between the Cherubim had the appearance of a man.‡ As to the passions ascribed to the Almighty, we read of his loving, hating, having mercy, taking vengeance, and so on. Good men are anxious, and very properly so, to raise the character of the Deity above that which is sustained by themselves; and what they affirm on these occasions may be abstractedly true. Revelation, however, has told us, that God *has spoken*, and further, that his ministering angels *have also spoken*, to man. If then, in either case, man may be said to be like unto God, he must have the faculty of speech. Nor can we see why it should be supposed unreasonable, that he should come from the hands of his Maker endued with this faculty; nor further, how he could have understood the first precept delivered to him, had his organs not been fitted to receive, or his mind to comprehend the import of, the words spoken. For our own part, we are extremely tenacious of the simple declarations of Scripture, and suspicious of every attempt to evade their simplest acceptation. We are, therefore, sorry to see Mr. Wraugham offering a sort of mid-way solution of this problem, between Simon and Bishop Walton, (p. 8, note.) But what necessity can there possibly be, in the nature of the thing itself, for supposing that all must be gradual and without miracle? Is it at all more difficult to endue man with speech, than it was at first to create him? or for Him, who formed man for society, at once to supply him with every requisite, than it was to cause the fruits to grow for his sustenance? Speech was as necessary to man as knowledge; and, whatever philosophers, such as Père Simon was, may think to the contrary, it is impossible for them to show, in any thing except theory, that any man has, without instruction from some

\* *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*, liv. iii. chap. xxi.

† Joshua, v. 13, 14.

‡ Ezek. i. 26.

other, ever yet acquired knowledge sufficient to raise himself above savage life, or to utter one intelligible sentence.

If, however, we follow the Father of the Oratory, we shall discover the true character and object of his philosophy. In Book I. chapter xiv. of the *Histoire Critique*, we are told that Gregory of Nyssa, not only believed that the Hebrew language was more modern than most others, but treated the opinion that God was author of the language used by Adam and Eve, as ridiculous in the extreme; his words are—

“ St. Gregoire de Nysse, qui la decide contre le sentiment commun des Juifs. Il dit que des personnes habiles dans l'étude de l'Ecriture Sainte, ont assuré que la langue Hebraïque est moins ancienne que plusieurs autres langues. . . . Le même Gregoire de Nysse se moque de ceux qui croient que Dieu a été le premier auteur de la langue qu'Adam et Eve ont parle; ce qu'il appelle *une sottise et une vanité ridicule des Juifs*: comme si Dieu, ajoute-t-il, avoit été une Maître de Grammaire, &c.”

The first of these opinions, as we shall presently see, the learned Father rejects: the second, however, he retains, because he thinks it is agreeable to reason. A little farther on, the convenient principle on which all this rests is let out, and, we are told, that

“ Il (*i. e.* Saint Gregoire) prétend que Dieu n'est point aussi l'auteur de la confusion des langues qui arriva en bâtissant la Tour de Babylone: car expliquant au même endroit en quel sens l'Ecriture attribué à Dieu cette confusion, il dit qu'on ne voit point dans la même écriture, que Dieu ait euseigné aucune langue aux hommes. . . . Et il ajoute de-plus, *que cette puissance naturelle de raisonner qui est dans l'homme, vient de Dieu, et qu'elle est la véritable cause de cette diversité de langues qui se trouve dans les nations différentes.*”

In a note at the foot of the page, the application of this principle is extended.

“ Cette opinion de St. Gregoire de Nysse semble estre opposée aux paroles de l'Ecriture, qui introduit Dieu parlant à nos premiers Pères aussi-tot qu'ils furent créés. Mais le même Père prévient cette objection, et y répond en niant absolument que Dieu ait parlé aux hommes de la manière qu'on entend ordinairement. Il prétend que *Moïse attribué à Dieu un langage avec les hommes, pour s'accommoder à leur foiblesse*, et que par ce langage nous devons seulement entendre *les signes de la volonté de Dieu.*”

We have been the more particular in giving these extracts at length, because however unimportant some may believe questions connected with the study of language to be, they are nevertheless occasionally the sources of the greatest revolutions in society. Who would imagine, for example, that in these short extracts, and on this almost neglected subject, we really have the principal,

and perhaps the very passages, which led the way to the rationalism or theology of modern Germany? that, in fact, all that has been termed *new* and *reasonable* in that deluded school, may be traced through the artful "il prétend" of a Jesuit, to a Father of the fourth century, of whom some have doubted, whether he was most a Platonic philosopher or a Christian divine? Now let the reader mark the exact conformity of the principle advocated by Bretschneider, in his reply to Mr. Rose, with the favourite of Père Simon, as extracted from Gregory of Nyssa. "If two farmers," says Dr. Bretschneider, p. 25, "enjoying favourable weather for their fields, equally ascribe the harvest to God; but one of them maintains that the rain and the sunshine entirely depend on a *special* decree of God, and a movement of his will, exercising an influence which exceeds the constantly proceeding energy of God," &c.—while the other maintains that the weather depends on the *constantly proceeding* energy of God," &c.—"surely," it is added, "nothing but ignorance could regard and pronounce the former *a religious*, and the latter *an irreligious man*." And then we are told that the *only* difference existing, is one which "*respects mode and manner*." We ask, is not this *only difference* a *mighty one*? And does it not comprehend all the real difference between the belief in a revelation from above, and one which trusts in human philosophy? Dr. Bretschneider, indeed, or Le Père Simon, or, if you please, Gregory of Nyssa, may call each of these *a religious* view of the question; but *one* only can be ascribed to the religion of Christ; the other is purely heathenish, and may perhaps challenge a belief just commensurate with the extent it professes to go; but it never can demand any thing like an implicit faith, or an entire and hearty obedience: and the consequence is, and must be, wherever it is entertained, to make all that really constitutes the value of religion a dead and worthless letter. Bretschneider has, indeed, truly remarked, that many of the ancient Fathers had recourse to philosophy, in explaining and recommending the Christian religion; and in these instances, it must be confessed, they were occasionally successful. Philosophy may be properly and effectually employed, as it was by Paul at Athens, in showing that revealed truth is not opposed to human reason, and that it will in no case oppose the results of real science: but when we come to allow that both stand on the same grounds, and that the spirit which directed Moses actually wrought in Socrates both the desire and the ability to reveal moral and religious truths, as some of these Fathers seem to have thought, we then cross the line which divides heaven and earth; and, as far as revealed truth is concerned, the Church of Christ is made but a sanctuary of Belial. The transition may indeed have seemed



easy, but the gulf passed is immense; and the consequence must ever be, as it has been, in this irrational rationalizing school, that while men have been professing to be wise, they have really become fools.

But, we would ask, where is the use or necessity of setting up principles of this sort? Does the nature of the language of Scripture require it? Père Simon seems to think after his prototype Gregory, that it does; otherwise we must use language which, however, we do not believe, viz. that God has bodily parts and passions.

“C'est ainsi qu'on attribüe à Dieu des bras, des mains, des oreilles, et d'autres membres par rapport aux hommes, sans que pour cela on pré-tende que Dieu ait ces membres.”

Now this principle, in the mouth of Eichhorn, will show that when Moses heard the thunders on Sinai, he interpreted it as the approving voice of God sanctioning his attempt to give the Israelites a law; and that hence the law was ascribed to God as its author. But we remark, the statement of facts and the application of the figures of speech, are two widely distinct things. God might indeed be spoken of as having the parts and passions of a man, without intending to inculcate this as a doctrine, because it is not possible he could make his declarations known to us, such as we are generally, in any other way. His approval of virtue or hatred of vice; his disposition to reward the good or to punish the bad, could scarcely be announced without premising something of this kind: but this is a widely different thing from saying, that we must therefore suppose every narrative we meet with to be a fable, or every miraculous interference to be a mere involution of language, which a little knowledge of rhetoric will enable us to resolve. Nothing surely can be more irrational than such a proceeding as this, nor, we believe, more astonishing, than that such men as Père Simon, Bretschneider, Eichhorn, and others, should advance and maintain anything so truly unscholarlike and nonsensical. Surely it ought to have occurred to men of so much thought and learning, that if any provision were really made for the soul of man, it ought to be made known to him in some way or other more convincing than conjecture; and that if such communication were made, it must be miraculous; otherwise it would be impossible to discover, whether it could be entitled to belief or not? And when we find the revelation, from one end to the other, laying claim to this character, and urging its precepts, on no other grounds, reason is constrained to allow that this is just what Scripture ought to do; and that in so doing, it lays open to us a religion which alone can command our belief, invigorate our



hopes, or insure our obedience. But to follow the Father of the Oratory—it is curious enough to remark, that although he disputes with Walton as to the manner in which he has endeavoured to show that the Hebrew is the primitive language, he nevertheless allows that this is most likely the fact; and in proof of this he has offered some very curious and interesting particulars. The argument, however, on which he principally rests, is the simplicity of the structure of the Hebrew when compared with other languages; and the ease, in this point of view, with which its words may be assimilated with the primitives of the Greek and Latin. To give extracts would be to extend this article too far; we will simply remark, that some of his laws for the permutation or addition of certain letters,\* are found as rules in the Sanscrit grammar, which it is impossible he could have seen; we mean those which regulate the changes of *r* and *s*, and the insertion of the nasal *n*, in certain cases. According to Simon's views, therefore, there is an affinity discoverable between the Hebrew and the Greek and Latin; and if so, with the Sanscrit also, notwithstanding the assertions of Mr. Vans Kennedy and Sir William Jones to the contrary,† and this we believe to be the fact. If this be true then, we need not be surprised to find, as Walton and others have asserted long ago, that fragments of this primitive language are to be found in all others.

An objection, however, has been taken, in modern times, to the position, that simplicity is the mark of a primitive tongue, because it is said, we find some ancient tongues most complex, while their derivatives, or more modern forms, are extremely simple. But this involves a *petitio principii*. No one has yet proved, nor can prove, that the Sanscrit on which this hypothesis is built, is even ancient,—much less a primitive tongue. As far as history will help us, the Pali appears to lay a much higher claim to antiquity, and just in this proportion is it more simple than the Sanscrit, as Mr. Clough's grammar abundantly proves. That the Sanscrit, as it now appears, was ever spoken, seems next to impossible; and this some of the Brachmans allow. If so, what claims can its

\* Mr. Vans Kennedy, after Sir William Jones, declaims most violently against all who shall attempt to alter any words in this way for the purposes of etymological inquiry, yet strange to say, the comparative vocabularies which he has given, offer some of the strangest contortions of this kind ever witnessed, *e. g.* Sanscrit, *ap-henam*, *οπιον*, opium: Sans. *ashta*, *οκτω*, octo. Sans. *richate*, (rather *rich-hate*,) *ορεγεται*, porrigit. Pers. *rāsād*. Sans. *tārā*, *αστη*, *sidera*, &c.

† Mr. Kennedy thinks that no Sanscrit and Arabic roots can be found signifying the same things: we believe, however, that a very considerable number of such roots can be

found, and we give बल बल; बर बर; अश अस; आप अब, اوب; अव اوي, as examples.

endless rules and exceptions, its supernatural refinements and vagaries lay to antiquity? The truth is, the whole is a fabrication from first to last, without evidence internal or collateral, philosophical or historical, for its basis; and it ought accordingly to be treated as "the baseless fabric of a vision."

From what has been said, it should seem that the assertions of many of our East Indian philologists ought not to be too readily credited; and particularly so, when they attempt to throw discredit in any way on the sacred Scriptures. To extended inquiry we should certainly be the last to object: but let it be extended in the just sense of the term: let theories be formed upon facts: and not facts be elicited from theories. In the next place, let us be most careful to adopt principles, both of reasoning and of interpretation, suitable to the several documents which may come before us; and, in endeavouring to instil just notions on these points into our younger brethren, let us be careful to recommend such works as are most likely to ensure habits of this description.

In this point of view, we hold the *Prolegomena* of Walton to be truly valuable. The investigations they contain are conducted on the soundest principles: and although the justness of some of the results arrived at may be questioned, as in the *History* by Aristæas of the Version of the Seventy, yet the inquiry, accompanied by such notes as those given by Mr. Wrangham and his friends, cannot fail to prove a most salutary exercise to the mind of the student. The great desideratum at this day is, a course of reading of this kind to be submitted to by those who are intended for the Church. Young men are too much left to choose for themselves in this respect; and the consequence is, they generally select that reading which is termed light, for the most obvious of all reasons—because it requires the least exertion. Hence, perhaps, it is that speculative divinity has so much, and so long usurped the public attention. In this, not the resources of the mind, but the powers of the ingenuity, are alone brought into action; and ingenious conjectures, about what is termed unfulfilled prophecy, are often made to pass for the very quintessence of theological usefulness—which must rarely happen where a sound and severe course of reading has once been submitted to. We have reason, however, to hope, that better things will shortly be realized. The study of the Oriental languages, and of Divinity in general, is very much advancing among us; and we do hope that Mr. Wrangham's work, which we can most cordially recommend, may be instrumental in giving an additional impulse to the good efforts so happily commenced. The work of Walton, indeed, stood in no need of commendation from us. Its merits are widely known, and every where acknowledged; and our principal

object has been, in the remarks here offered, to show that, where great and dangerous failures have been made, the cause has generally existed in a want of a more extended knowledge of works of this description. Of Mr. Archdeacon Wrangham we cannot speak too highly as an editor. The notes, with which he has enriched this edition, must have cost him very great labour and care. His fac-similes of some of the most valuable Biblical MSS., as well as his specimens of Oriental alphabets, are superior to those originally given by Walton; and upon the whole his Latinity, though perhaps less simple in its structure, is not less pure or elegant than that of his author.

---

ART. IV.—*The History and Antiquities of the Town and Minster of Beverley, in the County of York, from the most early period; with historical and descriptive Sketches of the Abbays of Watton and Meaux, the Convent of Haltemprise, the Villages of Cottingham, Leckonfield, Bishop and Cherry Burton, Walkington, Risby, Scarborough, and the Hamlets comprised within the Liberties of Beverley; illustrated by numerous Engravings, &c.* By George Oliver, Vicar of Clee, Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honourable Lord Kensington; a Corresponding Member of the Society of Antiquaries, Scotland. London: Baldwin and Cradock. 4to. pp. 576. 2l. 2s.

THE sciences of topography and antiquities, which yield a never-failing source of amusement to those who delight in tracing the progress of the human mind through all its grades and ramifications, and comparing the simple manners and rude institutions of our remote predecessors with those which distinguish the present age of pretended liberality in religion and politics, and real refinement in every valuable art and useful science, are advancing with great rapidity into general estimation, and as they become better known, their value will be still more highly appreciated. Many of our forefathers of the last century placed no greater value on a castellated ruin or a noble vestige of Druidical architecture, than the pounds, shillings and pence that were vested in the materials; and if the expense of removal promised to exceed the value of the chattels, they were deemed a cumbrous burden to the soil, and the tasteless owner became impatient for their demolition by the hand of time. We ourselves have known, and we speak it with regret, many fine specimens of ruin brought to the hammer, whose preservation would have been equally a credit to the proprietor, and a grace and ornament to the country; and the dilapidation and removal of the splendid monument of Avebury, which had escaped the ravages of barbarism in every

age, and was reserved for desecration in a period of comparative enlightenment, may be considered as a national calamity, which, however we may deplore, can never be retrieved. Those days of more than Gothic infatuation have passed away, and a new light of science has arisen to illuminate the present age, which, by expanding the reason, imbues the mind with better feelings. The great Leland, *clarum et venerabile nomen*, though personally engaged in the herculean labour of valuing and alienating the monastic property, regretted the demolition of the noble edifices which contained those gigantic establishments; and aware that expostulation would be unavailing, while the fever of destruction prevailed, which, having been excited into action by the arbitrary mandate of a powerful monarch, raged wildly through the country, and lit up the deadly fire of a burning enthusiasm in the bosoms of all ranks of people; he adopted the expedient of softening the mind by endeavouring to inspire a relish for such sciences as would induce the preservation of those sublime models of the taste and magnificence of our forefathers. With this benevolent intention in view, after his official duties were completed, he spent many years in travelling through the country at his own private expense to collect materials towards a general view of British topography and antiquities, and many more in arranging and digesting them into form and order for the public eye. His success can scarcely be pronounced commensurate with his expectations, for not only the monastic structures, but also the most valuable ecclesiastical ornaments and decorations with which our churches and cathedrals were enriched and adorned, fell a victim to the reckless fury of revolutionary bigotry, or the indiscriminate cupidity of avaricious plunder, during the prevalence of a second burst of fanaticism. His exertions, however, were followed up by the application and industry of several eminent characters in the intermediate ages down to the present time.

The seventeenth century witnessed few advocates for these sciences, but those few were earnestly devoted to the cause, and the names of Dugdale and Camden, Drayton and Selden, Verstegan and Langtoft, shine amidst the darkness of the topographical atmosphere. The commencement of the succeeding century gave us Hearne and Stukely, the Gales and the commentators on Camden; for the taste was now forming with irresistible rapidity. Then followed Toland and Borlase, the learned and ingenious Whittaker, the lively Pennant, and the indefatigable Grose, whose graphic illustrations effected a striking revolution in the science; and he has been refined on and brought to perfection by the industry of Britton. Topographical writers are

now numerous, and deservedly encouraged; for, to a downright Englishman, nothing can surpass in interest, the record of works of art and industry which dignify and adorn his native country, of the customs and peculiarities of his forefathers, and the local history of bygone times. These are often preserved in some fugitive form, highly estimated perhaps by the present possessor as an invaluable treasure, but if not placed on permanent record, may be converted by his tasteless successor to "base purposes" as a heap of useless lumber.

It is true, some discrimination is necessary to direct the all-pervading predilection for typographical inquiry which at present distinguishes the people of this island. We refer to the general censure which has been cast by Grose on a loose and unsatisfactory method of compiling local histories. "They consist," says he, "merely of incorrect pedigrees, futile etymologies, verbose disquisitions, crowds of epitaphs, lists of landholders, and such farrago, thrown together without method, unanimated by reflections, and delivered in the most uncouth and horrible style." For there are still many who are too much pleased with trifles to yield their serious attention to matters of real importance. With these, the account of a bull-baiting, or the tradition of an extraordinary supernatural appearance, will supersede the record of great events; and the tale of a *corpus-christi* procession will go for more than a scientific description of the magnificent architecture of a cathedral. And there are also many with whom an inflated style will pass for sublimity, and a pompous display of cramp and sonorous verbiage indicate deep learning and sound erudition.

Within the two extremes of unmeaning gossip and sonorous bombast, the topographer should take his sober and steady walk; he must neither magnify trifles, nor suppress, by an inadequate notice, such matters as are and ought to be deemed of public importance. His style should be plain and simple, and his text unincumbered with illustrations and authorities, which tend to violate alike the smoothness of his diction, and the unity of his design. Let these be thrown into Notes or an Appendix, where, without the slightest tax upon the patience of any class of readers, he may be as communicative as he pleases; for the unlearned are not under the necessity of referring to those parts of the work which do not appear to be included in the general plan; while the man of letters will experience both gratification and interest in the perusal of these incidental notices, which are better indications of the progress of an author's mind in the prosecution of his design, than can possibly be developed in the formal construction of the work itself.

We have been led to these cursory remarks, by the perusal of Mr. Oliver's History of Beverley, a topographical work of a respectable character. The author possesses a very clever knack of availing himself of many aids which a common mind would overlook. He has considered his subject with attention, and digested his materials well. His arrangement is clear and lets us at once into the general nature of his plan, and the execution is highly creditable to his taste and judgment. The notes are numerous, and the incidental remarks dispersed throughout the volume speak favourably of his industry and erudition. He illustrates with great ingenuity the different appearances of the incipient town under the successive rule of the Britons, the Romans, the Saxons and the Danes; and presents us with a lucid account of the peculiar ceremonies of the Druidical religion, which was practised there, as is satisfactorily evidenced by the fact of British tumuli having been discovered in the vicinity; and we are presented with plates of British urns, bones, &c. actually dug from the soil. He takes a comprehensive view of the whole district as it existed in those primitive times, when its laws and religion had never been subjected to the imperious dictum of a marauding invader, or its polity modified by the introduction of foreign arts, civilization or commerce; and concludes thus:—

“Here then the Druids had established themselves in all the dignity of ecclesiastical pride; the givers of laws, the arbiters of life and death. Their residence was probably at Drewton, (Druid's Town) near the holy Beaver Lake; their place of initiation within the shady groves of Llegen-fylliad, (Leckonfield) and their cemetery at Beorh or Bwr, (Burton) where many vestiges of this fact still remain. This religious establishment was under the protection of the chief residing at Petuaria, (Beverley) as that at Godmanham was defended by the chief and his tribe at Delgovitia, (Londesbro'.) Thus established and protected, the Druids were elevated into objects of terror and superstitious veneration to the natives, &c. &c.”—(p. 13.)

Thus the town of Beverley has been built upon a site that in ancient times was the polluted scene of those abominable and revolting superstitions which were practised by our Druidical predecessors under the assumed sanction of religion; and the very name of *Beverley* is derived from a peculiar ceremony which constituted one of the most solemn rites of worship. Let Mr. Oliver describe it.

“In the time of the great god Hu, who is the same as Noah, mankind were involved in an universal profligacy of manners. A communication was therefore made from heaven that the corruptions of the world should be purified by fire and water; and that from the bursting of the Lake Llion an overwhelming flood of the latter element should proceed to deluge the earth and destroy its impure inhabitants. In consequence of this revelation, a vessel was constructed without sails, in which were



preserved a male and female of every species of animals, and also a man and a woman named *Dryvavr* and *Dryvach*. When these were safely inclosed within the womb of the vessel, a pestilential wind arose, replete with poisonous ingredients, which spread devastation and death throughout the world. Then followed a fiery deluge, which melted the rocks, and split the earth asunder. After this the Lake Llion burst forth, which inundated the globe, and destroyed the whole creation of men and animals, except the favoured few who had sought protection in the sacred vessel. And thus the world was purified by fire and water from the pollutions which the sins of men had accumulated upon it. When the destruction was complete, the *Avanc* or *Beaver*, a symbol of the floating Ark, *was drawn out of the Lake* by the oxen of Hu Gadarn; Gwydion formed the rainbow as an attendant on the sun, and an assurance was given to the favoured pair by whom the world was destined to be re-peopled, that the Lake should burst no more. Hence this spot, which was undoubted the consecrated scene of the diluvian celebrations, terminating invariably in the actual ceremony of drawing the floating Ark or Beaver out of the Lake, acquired the distinguishing appellation of *Llyn yr Avanc*, or the *Beaver Lakes*.”—(p. 12.)

Nothing is certainly known respecting the progress of Christianity in this district till the seventh century, when the great names of Paulinus, Wilfrid, John of Beverley, and other eminent ecclesiastics gave it an impetus which insured the most complete and triumphant success. The latter holy man was canonized by Pope John XX., his relics were gorgeously enshrined, and miracles were said to be performed at his tomb; and it was to the overwhelming authority of his name and influence that the town was indebted for much of its future prosperity. Pilgrimages were made to his shrine; prayers were offered up to him in the character of a mediator; and the name of John of Beverley, even so late as the fifteenth century, was considered a tower of strength in the day of battle. These errors, which had accumulated and increased by length of time and unrestricted indulgence, were the gradual forerunners of REFORMATION. Wickliffe lamented bitterly the prostration of genuine religious principles at the unholy altar of superstition, sanctioned by the lawless authority of an infallible pontiff; and the spirit which that meek and pious Christian excited was never extinguished. It is true a great evil was sustained by the alienation of the monastic property, but as purification can alone be obtained by the fermentative process, so it was altogether impossible to cleanse religion from its accumulated rottenness without a considerable degree of excitement and agitation; and our gratitude for what remains exceeds our regret for that which is lost.

In the reign of Charles I. the town of Beverley occupies a prominent station. Situate on the great road between the garrisons of Hull and York, it was an object of some importance to each



of the contending parties. The celebrated Sir John Hotham, who excluded his monarch from the town of Hull, was the representative in parliament for Beverley at this time, and after the abandonment of his command and flight from the garrison, was taken into custody in the midst of his constituents under circumstances of great interest.

“Orders were issued by the parliament for his apprehension. But the unfortunate governor had received a secret intimation of their design, and escaped, after a guard of soldiers had invested his house. He fled with precipitation from the town on one of his fleetest horses, and left his pursuers far behind, intending to take refuge in his house at Scorbro’, which he had previously fortified, and secured by a garrison of soldiers devoted to his interest, under whose protection he might have proceeded forward to York, and have found safety with the royal party. Dreading, however, a pursuit, he forsook the public road, and fled with the utmost rapidity to Stone-Ferry; but the boat was not at its moorings, and he had no time to lose, neither would he venture to remain in that exposed situation, because his person was well known to the country people, and therefore he made the best of his way to Wawn. Here his malignant fortune again prevailed. The ferry-boat had proceeded up the river with a party of pleasure, and he was once more disappointed in his hope of crossing the water. The wretched fugitive was now utterly at a loss what course to pursue, conscious that the tidings of his flight would soon be made public, and that escape or concealment would then be equally impracticable. His sole remaining consolation was, that haply the inhabitants of Beverley were yet ignorant that he had abandoned his charge, and he determined to proceed thither with all possible expedition, and confide himself to the honour of those friends with whom he had always held a confidential intercourse as the representative of the town in parliament.

“At this time the troops in Beverley were under the command of Colonel Boynton, and amounted to near 1000 men. Sir Matthew Boynton, his father, was invested with a command in Hull garrison, and on the governor’s flight had despatched an express to his son, apprizing him of the circumstance, and communicating the order for his apprehension. The soldiers were drawn up in the Market-place when Sir John Hotham arrived; and, on the sight of them, he felt irresolute whether it would not be expedient to retrace his steps before he was recognized; but the soldiers *presented* their arms at his appearance, as is usual to a superior officer, and this manœuvre encouraged him to ride up and place himself at their head. The inferior officers, being altogether unacquainted with Sir John’s defection, obeyed his orders to march, and he led them towards the North-Bar, considering that if he should succeed in conducting them to his house at Scorbro’, he should be prepared to endure a siege of sufficient duration to cover his escape to the royal army. But, alas! for the instability of all human calculations, he had not proceeded many yards before he was met by Colonel Boynton, who, seizing the bridle of Sir John’s horse without ceremony, declared him his prisoner as a traitor to the commonwealth. Resistance was in vain; and Sir John submitted himself implicitly to his nephew’s direction. Still all hope had not for-

saken him, for the drowning man will endeavour to preserve his life by struggling with a hazel wand. In Beverley he had many sincere friends on both sides of the question, and he calculated on the possibility of escaping through some collateral street, and secreting himself under the first roof which should present itself to his eye as containing an occupier in whom he could confide. He knew that three of the body corporate were staunch royalists, and, under present circumstances, would doubtless afford him their protection, and the town contained many private gentlemen of the same firm and unyielding principles. These reflections were the work of a moment, and he concluded that the experiment was worth trying. As the party advanced through the streets, Hotham suddenly struck his spurs into his horse's side, and darting down a cross lane with the swiftness of an arrow, vanished from their sight. By this time the town was raised and the streets were full of people. When Colonel Boynton saw his prisoner take this precipitate step, he despatched a company of soldiers in pursuit of the fugitive, and charged the populace, at their peril, to assist in his capture. Poor Hotham had little chance of escape, beset as he now was by numbers; and after some ineffectual attempts to ride through the crowds by which he was soon surrounded, he was knocked off his horse with the butt end of a musket, and finally secured. The garrison at Scorb'ro' was now marched to Beverley, and the town was strengthened by the parliament with other additional forces. The rescue of Sir John Hotham was attempted the next day by a body of his majesty's forces, who invested the town of Beverley for that purpose, but were repulsed by Colonel Boynton with considerable loss. Thus abandoned to his fate, this miserable man was long detained in prison, and not brought to trial from a deficiency of evidence to prove his guilt. At length he was tried, together with his son, who was apprehended about the same time with himself, on a similar charge; and they were both found guilty, condemned to death, and executed at the beginning of January, 1645."—pp. 221—223.

The interests of the town, after this unholy contest, appear to have been abandoned. It rapidly degenerated till the beginning of the eighteenth century; when having arrived at the extreme point of the descending scale, its affairs took a turn, and the town progressively improved until it once more assumed its rank and energy as the effective capital of the East Riding; and its present state exhibits no inconsiderable specimen of a substantial, orderly, well-governed provincial town.

Many ancient streets and ways have changed their names, and others have so entirely disappeared, that the sites can no more be traced than the present residence of the ten tribes of Israel. The Church of St. Nicholas is wholly destroyed, and its site is occupied by a bed of osiers. Hospitals and religious houses have vanished like a shadow; and meetings have recently been held to discuss the propriety of admitting the Catholics to political power, where the same perverted system of faith once rioted in all the pomp of ecclesiastical magnificence. An excellent seminary of

education remains as the wreck of these princely establishments, though the primitive school-room has fallen a prey to the ravages of time. This institution has had the good fortune to send up to the Universities many talented individuals whose learning has placed them at the very summit of their profession.

We do not altogether coincide with our author's views and sentiments when he reprobates and undervalues the architecture of Italy and Greece; but we agree with him in preferring the Gothic as the style best adapted to ecclesiastical purposes. The decorations of Beverley Church are of a superior order; and its style of architecture, in some of the more prominent parts, is unique. The west front is an uncommonly rich specimen of the perpendicular style, and is pronounced to be unequalled in this kingdom; and the two western towers possess such excellence of design and execution, that the great Sir Christopher Wren is said to have copied them as models for those which he added to Westminster Abbey. The "Percy Shrine," as a funeral monument, is beautiful beyond comparison. It is placed in the choir near the altar, and is dedicated to the memory of Idonea, the daughter of Robert Lord Clifford, and wife of Henry, second Lord Percy of Alnwick, who died about the year 1365.

We are sorry to be under the necessity of accompanying our good opinion of the work before us with the language of regret; but we would ask Mr. Oliver one question. Having presented us with a sketch of the botany of the district, why has he omitted a dissertation on geology and mineralogy? In the present extension of knowledge, when these sciences are become matters of school-boy attainment, it will be difficult to assign any valid reason why the investigation of soils and minerals, so useful and interesting, has been altogether omitted. And as space has been found for describing the different transparencies exhibited in the windows on occasion of the acquittal of the late Queen Caroline, and for inserting the names of the horses that ran at the last Beverley races, some attention might have been paid to subjects of a graver description.

---

ART. V.—*Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe, Wife of the Right Hon. Sir Richard Fanshawe, Bart. Ambassador from Charles the Second to the Court of Madrid in 1665. Written by Herself. To which are added, Extracts from the Correspondence of Sir Richard Fanshawe.* London: Henry Colburn. 1829.

FEW Works known to exist in MS. have attracted keener attention from the portions which have occasionally crept into light, or have

excited a stronger desire that the whole should become *publici juris*, than that now before us. The History of the authoress and of her husband, will be sufficiently detailed in the course of our following remarks, but of the history of the publication itself, we have still much to ask; for notwithstanding a very copious preliminary apparatus—a Dedication informing the Duchess of Clarence that these *Memoirs* have long been kept back, but are now printed—a Preface, noticing the principal claims which they possess upon our attention—and an Introductory Memoir, very feebly paraphrasing and most unseasonably forestalling that which is far better told in the body of the volume—in spite of these 73 pages, which we heartily wish had never been written, we learn absolutely nothing of the *Memoirs* themselves, unless the very unsatisfactory avowal that they are transcribed from a copy of a copy. Where their original exists, or whether it exists at all—what guarantee there may be for their authenticity, as now given—why they have slept in MS. during a century and a half, and what spell has at length dissolved their slumber, are points upon which not an atom of information is vouchsafed to assuage the very natural curiosity of the reader.

The Editor, as we learn from his subscription to the Dedication, is Mr. Charles Robert Fanshawe; from whose name we were at first induced to conjecture that he might be a descendant of the parties to whom he has done tardy justice. But in this supposition we were most probably deceived; for the last paragraph of the Introductory Memoir states, that beyond the year 1705, no trace has been discovered of their posterity. In the absence of claims of consanguinity, Mr. Fanshawe may have been guided to his task by his *homonymous* pretensions; nevertheless, these are insufficient to account for his possession of the MS. Were it otherwise, the richly-stored shelves at Althorpe might yet hope to produce the missing Cantos of the *Faerie Queen*, and the lost Decades of the Prince of Roman History might be expected from the still existing family of Livius. Nothing more, however, is communicated, except that the Editor has conceived his duties to be “rather of a negative than positive description,” a conception which, unhappily, has not only been most powerfully entertained, but most pertinaciously acted upon; that he has altered the spelling in the MS., or, as he himself expresses it, with a slight savour of contradiction—that he has *corrected* the *orthography*; that “the MS. is not so perfect as might have been wished, as there are a few evident mistakes in dates, the names of persons are sometimes mis-spelt, and one or two trifling discrepancies occur”—admissions which do not tend to increase our confidence; and lastly, what is most important, that

“the MS. from which this volume is printed was copied in 1786, from one written in 1766, by Lady Fanshawe’s great granddaughter, Charlotte Colman, from the original, which was written under her Ladyship’s inspection about four years before her death.” To be sure this statement is *a little* modified by and by, when we are again told that “the MS. from which this volume is printed is *said* to have been transcribed in 1676 (?) by Lady Fanshawe’s ‘great granddaughter, Charlotte Colman.’” We will not dwell upon the date, which is manifestly an error chargeable upon the compositor; but the last words are printed as a quotation, and we cannot help wishing that we had been told whence they are cited. It is possible that we might then also have learned how Charlotte Colman was known to be great granddaughter of a stock of which no descendant had been traced for more than half a century; by whom it was *said* that Lady had made the copy; by what means she was enabled to make it; and how her transcript has passed into the hands by which it is now employed.

Doubtless all these matters *may* be satisfactorily explained: and we do not mean by our above observations, to do more than to express our regret, for the credit of a very interesting volume, that it has not been presented under a shape less exposed to suspicion. We think it probable that we have before us, in the main, the original *Memoirs*—of which, by some unexplained accident, a faulty copy has fallen to the share of the present Editor; who knowing the expectation which had been awakened by some Extracts given long ago in the *Biographia Britannica*, and in Miss Seward’s *Anecdotes*, (how gat they there?—is equally a question with us,) has carried the whole MS. to the “European Publisher;” as Lady Morgan, we know not why, has termed the polytypical Mr. Colburn; and that a joint-stock speculation has been the result.

Having thus disburdened ourselves of our misgivings, our task, as far as Criticism is concerned, is nearly done. Lady Fanshawe’s merits will speak for themselves. She was a high-minded and ardent-spirited woman, whose keen and generous sensibilities were tempered and regulated by an extraordinary portion of firmness and courage. She not only lived in times of universal public interest, and shared her portion, and perhaps more than her portion, of public danger; but the whole web of her private life was tintured with romantic colouring, and interwoven, if we may so say, with powerful incident. On every account we shall wish as much as possible to convey the outline of her narrative in her own words, for none others can be so effective.

Ann Harrison, afterwards Lady Fanshawe, eldest daughter of Sir John Harrison, of Balls, in the County of Hertford, was born

on the 26th of March, 1625, and when she had just attained her fifteenth year, she lost her mother, of whom the following remarkable anecdote is related, very much in conformity both with the received belief of the times, and as we shall have occasion to show more than once, with the particular bias of Lady Fanshawe's own mind.

“ Dr. Howlsworth preached her funeral sermon, in which, upon his own knowledge, he told before many hundreds of people this accident following: that my mother, being sick to death of a fever three months after I was born, which was the occasion she gave me suck no longer, her friends and servants thought to all outward appearance that she was dead, and so lay almost two days and a night, but Dr. Winston coming to comfort my father, went into my mother's room, and looking earnestly on her face, said she was so handsome, and now looks so lovely, I cannot think she is dead; and suddenly took a lancet out of his pocket and with it cut the sole of her foot, which bled. Upon this he immediately caused her to be laid upon the bed again and to be rubbed, and such means as she came to life, and opening her eyes, saw two of her kinswomen stand by her, my Lady Knollys and my Lady Russell, both with great wide sleeves, as the fashion then was, and said, Did not you promise me fifteen years, and are you come again? which they not understanding, persuaded her to keep her spirits quiet in that great weakness wherein she then was; but some hours after she desired my father and Dr. Howlsworth might be left alone with her, to whom she said, I will acquaint you, that during the time of my trance I was in great quiet, but in a place I could neither distinguish nor describe; but the sense of leaving my girl, who is dearer to me than all my children, remained a trouble upon my spirits. Suddenly I saw two by me, clothed in long white garments, and me thought I fell down with my face in the dust; and they asked why I was troubled in so great happiness. I replied, O let me have the same grant given to Hezekiah, that I may live fifteen years, to see my daughter a woman: to which they answered, It is done; and then, at that instant, I awoke out of my trance; and Dr. Howlsworth did there affirm, that that day she died made just fifteen years from that time.”—pp. 26—28.

Lady Harrison had educated her daughter carefully: French, singing, dancing, the lute, the virginal, and fine needlework, were among her accomplishments. In these, notwithstanding a natural high flow of spirits, she appears to have made very sufficient advances; and although, as she confesses with a most winning frankness, all exercises, such as riding, running, skipping and activity, were her delight, and she was, in short, that which “grown people call a hoyting girl;” nevertheless, at her mother's death, she “flung away these little childishnesses,” and was fully able to take upon herself the charge and ordering of her father's house and family.

Sir John Harrison was eminently distinguished for his loyalty to the unhappy Charles, whose troubles were, about this time,



commencing. His estate suffered largely during the Rebellion, and his losses were computed at not less than 130,000*l.* When the King retired to Oxford, in 1643, Sir John Harrison, and his family, accompanied the Court thither, and the privations to which they were subjected, afford a fearful picture of the miseries of Civil dissension. Their lodging was at a garret in a Baker's shop, in an obscure street; their table was provided with a single dish, and that not well ordered; money they had none; and of clothes not more than a man or two brought in their cloak-bags. Their condition, however, was by no means worse than that of many others of equal quality; and it appears to have been endured, by most, with cheerfulness and resignation. War in its most hideous forms was raging around them; and the throng of unprovided multitudes, pressed together in narrow limits, generated many sicknesses, and amongst others the Plague. The King so highly estimated the services of Sir John Harrison, who had pledged himself to lend 160,000*l.* for the payment of the rapacious and undeserving Scots, that he sent him a Warrant for a Baronetcy, an honour which the Knight prudently declined as above his present fortunes. It was at this turbulent period, nevertheless, that Sir Richard Fanshawe claimed the hand of his Bride:

εἰς ποῖον ἦλθες οἶκον ὑμεναίων μετὰ;

and never were nuptials, though commenced under inauspicious omens, and celebrated without customary pomp, productive of greater mutual happiness. Sir Richard had been sworn Secretary at War to Prince Charles, with a promise of future advancement. Lady Fanshawe's nominal portion was 10,000*l.*; but the stock *in esse* upon which they commenced their matrimonial voyage, did not amount to 20*l.* between the two.

Sir Richard Fanshawe was born in 1608, the youngest son of Sir Henry Fanshawe, of Ware Park, in Hertfordshire, but originally of an old family in the County of Derby, who died in 1616. The eldest son was elevated to the Peerage, as Viscount Fanshawe of Dromore, in Ireland, and Richard having been educated by Thomas Farnaby—whom Wood represents, (and we believe justly,) to have been the most eminent Rhetorician, Grammarian, Poet, Grecian and Latinist of his day, and a man of "martial humour" (*plagosus Orbilius*) to boot—and at Cambridge, for a short time,—studied the Law at the Inner Temple. The profession but little accorded with his taste, and he spent some years on the Continent, especially at Madrid. On his return to England, probably from his intimate acquaintance with the Spanish manners and language, he was appointed Secretary to Lord Aston's embassy, about 1630. In this office he continued eight

years, and on quitting it he married, as we have shown above, a beautiful and amiable woman, after the customary manner of younger brothers without preferment.

During Lady Fanshawe's first confinement, Sir Richard was suddenly called away on public business. The distress in which she was left may be adequately determined from the following touching passage:

“The beginning of March, 1645, your father went to Bristol with his new master, and this was his first journey: I then lying-in of my first son, Harrison Fanshawe, who was born on the 22<sup>d</sup> of February, he left me behind him: as for that, it was the first time we had parted a day since we married; he was extremely afflicted, even to tears, though passion was against his nature; but the sense of leaving me with a dying child, which did die two days after, in a garrison town, extremely weak, and very poor, were such circumstances as he could not bear with, only the argument of necessity; and, for my own part, it cost me so dear, that I was ten weeks before I could go alone; but he, by all opportunities, wrote to me to fortify myself, and to comfort me in the company of my father and sister, who were both with me, and that as soon as the Lords of the Council had their wives come to them I should come to him, and that I should receive the first money he got, and hoped it would be suddenly. By the help of God, with these cordials I recovered my former strength by little and little, nor did I in my distressed condition lack the conversation of many of my relations then in Oxford, and kindnesses of very many of the nobility and gentry, both for goodness sake, and because your father being there in good employment, they found him serviceable to themselves or friends, which friendships none better distinguished between his place and person than your father.

“It was in May, 1645, the first time I went out of my chamber and to church, where, after service, Sir William Parcoust, a very honest gentleman, came to me, and said he had a letter for me from your father, and fifty pieces of gold, and was coming to bring them me. I opened first my letter, and read those inexpressible joys that almost overcame me, for he told me I should the Thursday following come to him, and to that purpose he had sent me that money, and would send two of his men with horses, and all accommodation both for myself, my father, and sister, and that Lady Capell and Lady Bradford would meet me on the way; but that gold your father sent me when I was ready to perish, did not so much revive me as his summons. I went immediately to walk, or at least to sit in the air, being very weak, in the garden of St. John's College, and there, with my good father, communicated my joy, who took great pleasure to hear of my husband's good success and likewise of his journey to him; we, all of my household being present, heard drums beat in the highway, under the garden wall. My father asked me if I would go up upon the mount to see the soldiers march, for it was Sir Charles Lee's company of foot, an acquaintance of ours; I said yes, and went up, leaning my back to a tree that grew on the mount. The commander seeing us there, in compliment gave us a volley

of shot, and one of their muskets being loaded, shot a brace of bullets not two inches above my head as I leaned to the tree, for which mercy and deliverance I praise God, and next week we were all on our journey for Bristol very merry, and thought that now all things would mend, and the worst of my misfortunes past, but little thought I to leap into the sea that would toss me until it had racked me; but we were to ride all night by agreement, for fear of the enemy surprising us as we passed, they quartering in the way; about nightfall having travelled about twenty miles, we discovered a troop of horse coming towards us, which proved to be Sir Marmaduke Roydon, a worthy commander, and my countryman: he told me, that hearing I was to pass by his garrison he was come out to conduct me, he hoped as far as was danger, which was about twelve miles; with many thanks we parted, and having refreshed ourselves and horses, we set forth for Bristol, where we arrived on the 20th of May. My husband had provided very good lodgings for us, and as soon as he could come home from the Council, where he was at my arrival, he with all expressions of joy received me in his arms, and gave me a hundred pieces of gold, saying, 'I know thou that keeps my heart so well, will keep my fortune, which from this time I will ever put into thy hands as God shall bless me with increase;' and now I thought myself a perfect queen, and my husband so glorious a crown, that I more valued myself to be called by his name than born a princess, for I knew him very wise and very good, and his soul doated on me."—pp. 45—50.

We are loth to break off here; for the little incident which follows, the natural wish of the young wife to display her influence over her husband, the gentle but uncompromising firmness with which he resisted her fond importunities to win from him the State secrets confided to his keeping,—the tenderness with which he regarded, and the affectionate good sense with which he overcame her feeling of disappointment—above all, the candid spirit in which she recounts her own trifling pettishness, are among the most beautiful pictures of *Home Scenery* with which we are acquainted. But the passage is one of those few which have been given to the public, whenever the *Memoirs* of Lady Fanshawe have been in part brought forward, and we therefore forbear to repeat it here unnecessarily.

Of the worthies of Cornwall, to which Lady Fanshawe next repaired, she observes that they are loyal and hospitable, but "of a crafty and censorious nature, as most are so far from London," an opinion diametrically opposite to the veteran proverb, οὐδὲν ἔργον εἰ δίκαιον ἀνὴρ ἀστυκός. In like manner, although she admits that the country hath great plenty, especially of fish and fowl, even this allowance is not made without a salvo, "but nothing near so sweet as within forty miles of London." At Truro, with a few servants, in her husband's absence, she defended her house (which contained a small trunk belonging to the Prince with some

jewels) until help came from the adjoining town. In protecting her own property she was not equally fortunate; the treachery of a friend (his name, Captain Bluett, we think, has been adopted by one of our Dramatists for a highwayman) cost them 200*l.*; and 300*l.* were stolen from Sir Richard, by the mutinous crew of a vessel which conveyed them to Scilly. Here they were wretchedly lodged, near the Castle in which the Prince lay. Their house contained three beds in two low rooms, and two little lofts, ascended by a ladder: yet this tenement sufficed for the accommodation of Lady Fanshawe, her sister, their servants, two official clerks, and a quantity of dried fish. When the lodgers awaked on the first morning, they were overpowered by cold, and at daylight discovered that their beds were nearly swimming in the sea; but the owner restored their confidence, by assuring them that this *never occurred except at Spring tides*. In this miserable abode they remained three weeks and odd days, destitute of clothes, meat and fuel, and truly "begging our daily bread of God, for we thought every meal our last." On sailing for Jersey, an ignorant Pilot carried them directly over the rocks, to the consternation of all the spectators. But the Spring tide owed, and, in this instance, paid them a good turn, and, moreover, it *chanced* to be high water.

After a short stay in Jersey, Lady Fanshawe came over to England, without her husband, on an endeavour to procure money. He soon afterwards joined her, but was obliged to remain in great privacy, for fear of imprisonment. It was during this visit that they had that interview with the dethroned King, then at Hampton Court, and rapidly approaching the last Scene of his bloody Tragedy, which has been so often cited, and which for this reason we need not again transcribe. The few words recorded of Charles, are in strict unison with the piety, the fortitude, and the resignation, which characterised him during the bitterness of his fate. "Child," was his answer to Lady Fanshawe, when at parting she wished him long life and happy years, "Child, if God pleaseth it shall be so, but both you and I must submit to God's will; and you know in what hands I am in."

France afforded this loyal couple a short asylum, during the troublous period which succeeded. On one occasion they met Sir Kenelm Digby, at a large dinner party, given by the Governor of Calais, and the profound knight, who appears always to have claimed the Lion's portion in conversation—

"enlarged somewhat more in extraordinary stories than might be averred, and all of them passed with great applause and wonder of the French then at table; but the concluding one was, that barnacles, a bird in Jersey, was first a shell-fish to appearance, and from that, stick-

ing upon old wood, became in time a bird. After some consideration, they unanimously burst out into laughter, believing it altogether false; and, to say the truth, it was the only thing true he had discoursed with them; that was his infirmity, though otherwise a person of most excellent parts, and a very fine bred gentleman."—pp. 72, 73.

We next follow Lady Fanshawe to Ireland. She was in Cork at the time that city was assaulted and taken by Cromwell's soldiery in November, 1650, and by her courage and dexterity, in the dead of night, and during the tumult of military occupation, she succeeded in obtaining a free pass for herself, her family, and goods. Among these last, were all Sir Richard Fanshawe's writings, the loss of which occasioned the General no slight uneasiness. He said, "It was as much worth to have seized those papers as the town; for I did make account to have known by them what these parts of the country are worth."

At Limerick Sir Richard Fanshawe took counsel on the King's interest with the Bishop of Londonderry and the Earl of Roscommon. To the latter, who was Lord Chancellor of Ireland, occurred a fatal, and very singular accident. The three Royalists had been writing, late at night, in his chamber; and as the privacy of their business would not admit the attendance of a servant, he carried a light to the stair head, when his visitors were parting. Here, by some mishap his foot slipping, he fell down the stairs, and fractured his skull, so that he died five days afterwards.

The adventure which next occurs is among the most veracious of Ghost stories. It carries with it that most desirable of all qualities in such tales, the strongest evidence of undoubting and implicit belief in the narrator; and we recollect not any rival to it, unless it be Sir Walter Scott's *Tapestryed Chamber*.

"From hence we went to the Lady Honor O'Brien's, a lady that went for a maid, but few believed it; she was the youngest daughter of the Earl of Thomond. There we staid three nights. The first of which I was surprised by being laid in a chamber, when, about one o'clock, I heard a voice that wakened me. I drew the curtain, and, in the casement of the window, I saw, by the light of the moon, a woman leaning into the window, through the casement, in white, with red hair and pale and ghastly complexion: she spoke loud, and in a tone I had never heard, thrice, 'a horse;' and then, with a sigh more like the wind than breath, she vanished, and to me her body looked more like a thick cloud than substance. I was so much frightened that my hair stood on end, and my night clothes fell off. I pulled and pinched your father, who never woke during the disorder I was in; but at last was much surprised to see me in this fright, and more so when I related the story and showed him the window opened. Neither of us slept any more that night, but he entertained me with telling me how much more these apparitions were usual in this country than in England; and we concluded the

cause to be the great superstition of the Irish, and the want of that knowing faith, which should defend them from the power of the Devil, which he exercises among them very much. About five o'clock the lady of the house came to see us, saying she had not been in bed all night, because a cousin O'Brien of her's, whose ancestors had owned that house, had desired her to stay with him in his chamber, and that he died at two o'clock, and she said, 'I wish you to have had no disturbance, for 'tis the custom of the place, that, when any of the family are dying, the shape of a woman appears in the window every night till they be dead. This woman was many ages ago got with child by the owner of this place, who murdered her in his garden, and flung her into the river under the window, but truly I thought not of it when I lodged you here, it being the best room in the house.' We made little reply to her speech, but disposed ourselves to be gone suddenly."—pp. 83—86.

Cromwell's successful progress in Ireland determined Sir Richard Fanshawe to seek a more secure retreat in Spain. The Dutchman, who commanded the vessel in which they sailed, is described by Lady Fanshawe to have been a most tempestuous master, and the greatest beast she ever saw of his kind. Scarcely had they passed the Straits of Gibraltar when a well-manned Turkish Galley bore down upon them. The Dutchman carried 200 men and 60 guns, but the ship was so deeply laden that most of them were useless. Nevertheless, as she was worth £30,000, by the aid of brandy it was determined that they would fight. The result is told so beautifully, and withal so briefly, that although it is another of those passages which is not now printed for the first time, we must deviate from our former course, and give it entire.

"This was sad for us passengers, but my husband bid us be sure to keep in the cabin, and not appear, the women, which would make the Turks think that we were a man-of-war, but if they saw women they would take us for merchants and board us. He went upon the deck, and took a gun and bandoliers and sword, and, with the rest of the ship's company, stood upon deck expecting the arrival of the Turkish man-of-war. This beast, the Captain, had locked me up in the cabin; I knocked and called long to no purpose, until at length the cabin-boy came and opened the door; I, all in tears, desired him to be so good as to give me his blue thrum cap he wore, and his tarred coat, which he did, and I gave him half a crown, and putting them on and flinging away my night clothes, I crept up softly and stood upon the deck by my husband's side, as free from sickness and fear as, I confess, from discretion; but it was the effect of that passion which I could never master.

"By this time the two vessels were engaged in parley, and so well satisfied with speech and sight of each others forces, that the Turks' man-of-war tacked about, and we continued our course. But when your father saw it convenient to retreat, looking upon me, he blessed himself, and snatched me up in his arms, saying, 'Good God, that love can make



this change!' and though he seemingly chid me, he would laugh at it as often as he remembered that voyage; and in the beginning of March we all landed, praised be God, in Malaga, very well and full of content to see ourselves delivered from the sword and plague, and living in hope that we should one day return happily to our native country: notwithstanding, we thought it great odds, considering how the affairs of the King's three kingdoms stood; but we trusted in the providence of Almighty God, and proceeded."—pp. 92—94.

This confidence in the Divine protection was well justified by the event, and not a little confirmed afterwards by another great danger from which they were preserved. Three days after they had landed, the vessel, from which they had just disembarked, was blown up in the harbour, through the negligence of the cabin-boy, with the loss of a hundred men and all its lading.

The wonders of Grenada were not likely to be thrown away upon a woman of such vivid imagination as that possessed by Lady Fanshawe; and accordingly she speaks in glowing language of the high trees and rich grass, and the large, deep, clear river, which beautify the neighbourhood of the goodly vast palace of the Alhambra; of its jasper courts, its fountains, its mosaic, and frost-work; of the keys carved in stone over its chief portal, and the Moorish motto, which boasted, in allusion to a figure standing below, "until that hand holds these keys, the Christians shall never possess this Alhambra;" and how, when Ferdinand and Isabella besieged the city, the King, as the custom was, shooting the first arrow, cut the stone-work which represented a chain, so that the keys, being loosened, fell, and remained in the hand underneath. We need not add that the town and kingdom of Grenada were conquered within a few days afterwards. Neither does she omit the iron grate fixed to the side of a rock, which no force has been able to wrench open since the Moors quitted their seat of government, though many have attempted it at the peril and with the sacrifice of their lives. Lady Fanshawe placed her ear to the keyhole, and heard a noise like the clashing of arms, and other shrill sounds not so readily distinguished.

"But standing high aloft low lay thine eare,  
And there such ghastly noyse of yron chaines  
And brasen cauldrons thou shalt rumbling heare,  
Which thousand sprights with long-enduring paines  
Doe tosse, that it will stonn thy feeble braines:  
And oftentimes great grones and grievous stowndes,  
When too huge toile and labour them constraines:  
And oftentimes loud strokes and ringing sowndes  
From under that deepe Rock most horribly rebowndes."

At the time of the battle of Worcester Lady Fanshawe was again in England; for three days after that disastrous event she

heard nothing of her husband, whether he were dead or alive. She then received an account that he was taken prisoner, and she was permitted a short interview with him, as he passed by Charing Cross on his route to close confinement in a little room in the Bowling Green at Whitehall. Here he was visited by a severe illness; and the scurvy, resulting from cold, hard marches, and ill lodging, brought him almost to death's door.

“During the time of his imprisonment, I failed not constantly to go, when the clock struck four in the morning, with a dark lantern in my hand, all alone and on foot, from my lodging in Chancery Lane, at my cousin Young's, to Whitehall, in at the entry that went out of King Street into the bowling-green. There I would go under his window and softly call him; he, after the first time excepted, never failed to put out his head at the first call, thus we talked together, and sometimes I was so wet with the rain, that it went in at my neck and out at my heels.”—pp. 116, 117.

Cromwell, however, respected and befriended him; and Lady Fanshawe has recorded not the least acute of that extraordinary man's speeches in a retort which he made concerning her husband to Sir Harry Vane, a far more sincere fanatic than himself. Lady Fanshawe strongly and repeatedly urged her suit for the prisoner's release, and this was backed by a Physician's certificate. The General instructed her to deliver this document at the Council Chamber; and upon receiving it he moved, that, since Sir Richard Fanshawe's continued imprisonment was manifestly of no service to their cause, he might have his liberty to take a course of physic, upon giving £4000 bail. Sir Harry Vane vehemently opposed the proposition. “That prisoner,” he said, “would do his best to hang them all if he had opportunity; and even if he were let out for a time, it was but fitting that he should take the engagement.” Cromwell dryly answered, “I never knew that the engagement was a medicine for the scorbutic;”—and the leader's will being thus sufficiently displayed, the Council admitted the Prisoner to bail.

On Cromwell's death, through the interest of Lord Pembroke, these bail-bonds were cancelled, and Sir Richard Fanshawe proceeded to France. Lady Fanshawe, a short time afterwards, obtained a pass in her maiden name, Ann Harrison; and by a gentle transmutation of letters, very pardonable under her particular circumstances, but which under others might have led to the gallows, converted the *H* into two *F*'s, the two *r*'s into *n*, the *is* into *sh*, and thus, malignant as she was, boldly approached the searchers at Dover, confronted them in her proper person, and without let or hindrance succeeded in crossing the Channel. On her route to Paris, on parting from Abbeville she was escorted by ten troopers

sent to her by the Governor; and a striking instance of the disturbed state of the times in France, the bad discipline of the army, and the inadequacy of the internal Police, is presented by the protection which they afforded her. About four leagues from the town, while ascending a hill, she was surrounded by more than fifty well-mounted horsemen, who, after a short parley, returned again into the wood. Surprised that so large a body of professed robbers, as she not unaptly concluded them to be, should quietly give way before inferior numbers, she asked an explanation from her escort; at which they laughed, and told her, "Madam, we are all of a company, and quarter in this town. The truth is, our pay is short, and we are forced to keep ourselves this way: but we have this rule, that if we in a party guard any company, the rest never molest them, but let them pass free." 'This reminds us of Captain Gibbet in the *Beaux Stratagem*, when he tells Archer that he belongs to "a marching Regiment, an old corps;" that "his company" is "marching across the country." "I am credibly informed," he concludes, "that there are Highwaymen upon this quarter, not, Sir, that I could suspect a Gentleman of your figure."

When Charles II. embarked at his Restoration, a third-rate frigate, the *Speedwell*, was appointed to convey Sir Richard Fanshawe and his family; but the King, who had always promised to appoint him one of the Secretaries of State, afterwards summoned him to his own ship. Lady Fanshawe has painted a most vivid picture of this voyage.

"Thus taking our leaves of those obliging persons we had conversed with in the Hague, we went on board upon the 23d of May, about two o'clock in the afternoon. The King embarked at four of the clock, upon which we set sail, the shore being covered with people, and shouts from all places of a good voyage, which was seconded with many volleys of shot interchanged: so favourable was the wind, that the ships' wherries went from ship to ship to visit their friends all night long. But who can sufficiently express the joy and gallantry of that voyage, to see so many great ships, the best in the world, to hear the trumpets and all other music, to see near a hundred brave ships sail before the wind with the vast cloths and streamers, the neatness and cleanness of the ships, the strength and jollity of the mariners, the gallantry of the commanders, the vast plenty of all sorts of provisions; but, above all, the glorious Majesties of the King and his two brothers were so beyond man's expectation and expression. The sea was calm, the moon shone at full, and the sun suffered not a cloud to hinder his prospect of the best sight, by whose light and the merciful bounty of God he was set safely on shore at Dover, in Kent, upon the 25th of May, 1660."—pp. 137, 138.

The prospects of ambition which Charles had held out to his faithful servant were destroyed, as Lady Fanshawe would have us

believe, and as we doubt not she firmly believed herself, by the evil influence of Lord Clarendon—and the reason which she assigns is sufficiently amusing—because her husband daily discovered the great Chancellor's *ignorance in State Affairs*, and showed it to the King. That Lord Clarendon and Sir Richard Fanshawe did not love one another is very probable: and it would be worse than idle, at the present day, to seek for their causes of disagreement. But the disappointment which Sir Richard shared was not singular. The King's easy nature had led him to make numerous inconsiderate promises which he had not the ability to redeem; and Sir Richard Fanshawe was one man, among hundreds, who had to complain that their reward was inadequate both to their deserts and their expectations. But however much Sir Richard may have exceeded other cavaliers in the ardour of his wishes that his Prince might recover his legitimate rights, it must be, at the same time, admitted, that he felt the beneficial effects of that recovery far more than the majority of his loyal brethren. Though the Seals were denied him, he was sent on a highly honourable employ, as matrimonial envoy to the Court of Lisbon, and on his return from this distinguished mission, he was the first person despatched to greet the future Queen on her arrival in England; and, in fine, was nominated Ambassador to Portugal.

On their return from this mission they passed through Canterbury, when Lady Fanshawe's appetite for the supernatural was once again banqueted.

"Saturday 5th, we went to Canterbury, and there tarried Sunday, where we went to church, and very many of the gentlemen of Kent came to welcome us into England.

"And here I cannot omit relating the ensuing story, confirmed by Sir Thomas Batten, Sir Arnold Breames, the Dean of Canterbury, with many more gentlemen and persons of this town.

"There lives not far from Canterbury a gentleman, called Colonel Colepeper, whose mother was widow unto the Lord Strangford: this gentleman had a sister, who lived with him, as the world said, in too much love. She married Mr. Porter. This brother and sister being both atheists, and living a life according to their profession, went in a frolick into a vault of their ancestors, where, before they returned, they pulled some of their father's and mother's hairs. Within a very few days after Mrs. Porter fell sick and died. Her brother kept her body in a coffin set up in his buttery, saying it would not be long before he died, and then they would be both buried together; but from the night after her death, until the time that we were told the story, which was three months, they say that a head, as cold as death, with curled hair like his sister's did ever lie by him wherever he slept, notwithstanding he removed to several places and countries to avoid it; and several persons told us they had felt this apparition."—pp. 171—173.

Many curious papers relative to this Colonel Colepepper are still preserved among the Harleian MS. (7560—71), none however, most happily, which bear upon the above horrible charges. In a draft of a petition to the Court of Chancery, at the end of H. MS. 7560, is an extraordinary account of a secret marriage which he contracted,—and in a mass of correspondence, in 7005, of the same collection, are many projects which evince that he was a man of very ingenious, though probably not of very sound intellect. We cannot refrain from citing one or two specimens of his style. The first reminds us of an attempt revived in our own times, by a celebrated Empiric, who possessed an annuity, to be paid *as long as his wife remained above ground*, and who, accordingly, preserved her in a glass case, by the side of the nuptial couch. The following letter is addressed by Colonel Colepepper to the Duke of Richmond, and is numbered 245 in the volume just mentioned.

“My Lord.—There is a gentleman in London that hath found out the way to embalme dead bodyes, and hath taken them out of their graves, after they have beene buried three-quarters of a yeare, and beene full of corruption, and in some fewe dayes hath made the bodyes as sweete as a glove leather, so that they may remayne for as many ages as a buff coate; which is a most excellent and useful invention, and far exceeds the Egyptian mummies; for although they will remayne for many ages, yet, being covered, they cannot bee scene. But this way we have the sight and comfort of our friends and relations, as often as we please, from generation to generation; and far exceeds any stone statute, which how rare so ever they are must needes fall short of the perfection of nature, which this way is entirely preserved; because he neither takes out the bowells nor brayne, nor any way diminishes or defaces the body, but preserves them entire as death left them, as your Lordship may see when you please, he having now a body which he hath kept fourtene yeares in his house; whereof I thought for to advertiss your Ldp, that the Duches of Richmond, who was the best part of the Creation, may be preserved to grace the house she gave your Lordship, and be her own Monument, that Lenox Law\* may ffind a gratefull remembrance. My Lord, haveing the honour to be descended of the Royall Blood of the glorious Kings of England and Scotland, (I) have right to concern myselfe for this noble persone, who is a Duches in both nations, and whom I know your Lordship honors. I shall waite on you to make my compliment of condolences as becomes my Lord, &c.”

The second paper which we shall cite (*ib.* 260) contains some

“Proposicions presented to the King’s most Excellent Majesty, by Colonel Colepepper. First, to enable every ship in his Majesty’s Royal Navy to burne ten or twelve ships a peece, without being hurt or consumed them selves, but shal always remayne in the state and con-

\* We are not sure of our reading in this word; whether Colonel Colepepper wrote *Law* or *Love*.

dicion of a Man of War, and fight better then any ship of her rate ever could doe before, after she has wrought the effect of a fire ship, and has burnt and destroyed ten or twelve ships. Secondly, to double the nomber of guns of every ship in the King's Royal Navey, so that every ship that caried but fifty peeeces of ordnance, shal now cary one hundred peeeces of ordnance, with out over charging the ship with more weight of guns, or requiring more powder or men then is now used. Thirdly, to enable every one of the King's ships to shoote greater number of small shot, than can be done in the same time by all the musketeers allowed for every ship in the King's whole Fleete. Fourthly, that I will make a bomb for London, Portsmouth, Chatham,\* and New Castle, which shal be cheap, and shal not only secure the ships in these rivers and burne and destroy the greatest Fleets, but shal open to receve ships, and be a bridg for communication for his Majesty's Forces. Fifthly, that I will make every one of the Kinges Townes and Castles impragnable against the greatest Armye, haveing also bombs and careayses: without any addition to their fortifications, by enabling a Garison of thre hundred men to shoote more shots then can be done in the same tyme by fifteen thousand men, and shall beate the greatest armye from their cannon, bombs and careayses, and fre all towns from the dainger of bombs and careayses, which are now the most dreadful things in the world. Sixthly, that I will find money to cloathe and paye twelve thousand Foote Soldiers, which shall not come out of the King's pocket."

It can be no matter of surprise that the Author of the above Propositions, should lay positive claim to the Discovery of the Longitude. The wonder would have been if he had not done so. A single other example of his public spirit must suffice. It is contained in a Letter to the Great Captain of the Day, (*ib.* 278) but is without a key.

" 14 February, 1706.

" D. Molborrow,

" Hearing that your Grace had offered twenty thousand pounds, for some thing which I can help your Grace with for nothing, I sent a Letter to acquaint your Grace therewith, and fearing the same is miscarried, I shall now make the said discovery, whereby your Grace will vindicate the wrongs due to the Queenes Majesty, ayde and assist the Crown of England, when you please to give audience to

" My Lord Duke,

" Your Grace's humble servant,

" Colepepper."

But to return to Sir Richard Fanshawe, from whom we have wandered too far. Spain was his next seat of Embassy, in 1664; and the greater part of the remainder of these *Memoirs* is occupied by the details of diplomatic ceremonials, in that most ceremonious kingdom. How, contrary to usual custom, and as a mark of

\* The nation had recently smarted under the disgrace and loss of the Dutch attack upon Chatham.



special honour, the Iberian forts gave the first salute on landing; how Don Juan de la Cueva, Duke of Albuquerque, Viceroy of Milan, of his Majesty's Privy Council, General of the Galleys, twice Grandee, the first Gentleman of his Majesty's Bed Chamber, and a near kinsman to his Catholic Majesty, whom God long preserve! having first, being seated and covered, expounded these titles to Lady Fanshawe, in the end, rose up, and making a low reverence, with his hat off, laid all these dignities, with his family and life, at her Excellency's feet; how on visiting his Duchess the soldiers stood to arms, and their Lieutenant displayed the colours, and the colours when lowered received a courtesy, and the Lieutenant a bow in return; how Lady Fanshawe laying her hand upon the wrist of the Duke's brother's right hand, and the Duke's brother putting his cloak thereupon, went up to the Duchess who stood at the top of the stairs; how Lady Fanshawe was put into every door and out at every door, and led down stairs by the Duke himself, even as she had been led up stairs by the Duke's brother; how Don Antonio de Pimentel, Governor of Cadiz, sent her perfumes, skins, gloves, embroidered purses, and other nacks of the same kind; how the Duke of Medina Celi led her to her coach, an honour which he had never paid to any but one, and that was to his Princess, the Queen of England; how the Duke d'Alcala led her eldest daughter, the younger (*quisnam fuit ille?*) the second, the Governor of Cadiz the third; and (alas for the bathos!) "Mrs. Kestrian carried Betty in her arms;" how at Seville the Conde de Molina presented her with a young Lion, which with many excuses she declined, saying she was of so cowardly a nature that she durst not keep company with it; and finally, how Sir Richard made his public entry into Madrid, clothed in such brave apparel as no words but those of his Lady are adequate to describe.

"Then my husband, in a very rich suit of clothes of a dark fille-monte brocade laced with silver and gold lace, nine laces, every one as broad as my hand, and a little silver and gold lace laid between them, both of very curious workmanship; his suit was trimmed with scarlet taffety ribbon; his stockings of white silk upon long scarlet silk ones; his shoes black, with scarlet shoe-strings and garters; his linen very fine, laced with very rich Flanders lace; a black beaver, buttoned on the left side, with a jewel of 1200*l.* value. A rich curious wrought gold chain, made in the Indies, at which hung the King, his Master's picture, richly set with diamonds, cost 300*l.* which his Majesty, in great grace and favour, had been pleased to give him at his coming home from Portugal. On his fingers he wore two rich rings; his gloves trimmed with the same ribbon as his clothes."—p. 214.

Who can wonder, after toiling through all this and much more painful magnificence, that, notwithstanding their great enter-

tainment, Lady Fanshawe assures her son, for whose use she composed these *Memoirs*, that "your father and myself both wished ourselves in a retired country life in England, as more agreeable to both our inclinations."

During their residence in Madrid, the King, Philip IV., died, and his obsequies are described at length. At the close of 1665, the Treaty between England and Spain, which Sir Richard Fanshawe had been sent to negotiate, being adj<sup>o</sup>sted, though not to the satisfaction of the English Cabinet, he was recalled; but before he could set out homeward, he was seized with a malignant fever, and expired on the 26th of June, 1666. Lady Fanshawe, in her desolation, received the most soothing attentions from those around her; and the Queen-mother, with the promptness for proselytism which distinguishes her Church, sent the Master of the Ceremonies of Spain, to invite the widowed Ambassadors to stay, with all her family, at Court; promising a yearly pension of 30,000 ducats; and a provision besides for the children, if they would renounce Protestantism. Lady Fanshawe returned all becoming acknowledgments for the liberality of this proposal: but how little she was inclined to barter the purity of her faith for worldly good, and how rootedly she was attached to the profession in which she had been bred, may be determined from a most touching and fervid prayer, which we extract below, composed in the bitterness of her soul's agony.

"O all powerful good God, look down from Heaven upon the most distressed wretch upon earth. See me with my soul divided, my glory and my guide taken from me, and in him all my comfort in this life; see me staggering in my path, which made me expect a temporal blessing for a reward of the great integrity, innocence, and uprightness of his whole life, and his patience in suffering the insolency of wicked men, whom he had to converse with upon the public employment, which thou thoughtest fit, in thy wisdom, to exercise him in. Have pity on me, O Lord, and speak peace to my disquieted soul, now sinking under this great weight, which, without thy support, cannot sustain itself. See me, O Lord, with five children, a distressed family, the temptation of the change of my religion, the want of all my friends, without counsel, out of my country, without any means to return with my sad family to our own country, now in war with most part of Christendom. But, above all, my sins, O Lord, I do lament with shame and confusion, believing it is them for which I receive this great punishment. Thou hast showed me many judgments and mercies, which did not reclaim me, nor turn me to thy holy conversation, which the example of our blessed Saviour taught. Lord, pardon me; O God, forgive whatsoever is amiss in me; break not a bruised reed. I humbly submit to thy justice; I confess my wretchedness, and know I have deserved not only this but everlasting punishment: but, O my God, look upon me through the merits of my Saviour, and for his sake save me: do with me and

for me what thou pleasest, for I do wholly rely on thy mercy, beseeching thee to remember thy promises to the fatherless and widow, and enable me to fulfil thy will cheerfully in this world; humbly beseeching thee that, when this mortal life is ended, I may be joined with the soul of my dear husband, and all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, in everlasting praises of thy Holy Name. Amen.”—pp. 284-7.

The remainder of her history may be told in a few words. She accompanied her husband's body to England, and directed its interment in the Church of Allhallows, Hertford, and afterwards at Ware. The Royal Family and the Ministers were not wanting in condolence, but other remuneration for past service was scantily dispensed; and, as Lady Fanshawe affirms, chiefly through the evil instigation of Lord Shaftesbury, whose memory will ill bear any additional burden of infamy, much of the ordinary diplomatic allowance was refused, and the necessary expenses of the deceased Ambassador's mission, were not defrayed without considerable inroads upon his family estates and fortunes. The MS. breaks off abruptly at the close of the year 1670, about six years before the date at which it is believed to have been composed. The latter days of this noble-spirited Lady were, most probably, passed in cheerless and contracted circumstances. Her best earthly hopes slept with her husband in his grave; but the ardent and unaffected tone of piety which breathes through her writings, furnishes a most consolatory belief, that she had far loftier and more enduring hopes fixed beyond this fleeting scene, in a home where there is no death, and where all tears are dried away.

ART. VI.—*A New System of Geology, in which the Great Revolutions of the Earth and Animated Nature are reconciled at once to Modern Science and Sacred History.* By Andrew Ure, M.D. F.A.S. Member of the Geological and Astronomical Societies of London, &c. &c. &c., Professor of Physics and Lecturer on Chemistry in the Andersonian University. London. Longman and Co. 1829. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

It is Cuvier, we think, who makes it a subject of regret that no Newton has yet arisen in Geology to adjust its principles and to define its boundaries. Many facts have been collected, and many ingenious theories have been unfolded, during the last forty years. We have the ample stores of Saussure and Deluc, of Parkinson, Werner and Von Buch; and we have the fascinating speculations of the French and German schools, with the more sober deductions of our own countrymen Greenough, Conybeare, Phillips, Jameson, Buckland, Kidd, Brande and Macculloch. But not-

withstanding the labours of so many eminent men, we are nearly as much in the dark as ever in regard to those secondary causes, which must have been employed by Infinite Wisdom in arranging the mineral substances which form the outer strata or crust of the globe, at that early period which preceded the creation of animals, and the epoch even of Sacred History itself.

There is a peculiarity, perhaps, in geological investigation which has rendered its results less precise than those of astronomy, chemistry, and indeed of every other branch of natural knowledge. The physical laws, for example, which regulate the motions of the planets have not, as far at least as human penetration can discover, ever undergone the slightest change. The principles which determined their orbits, distances, times of revolution and rotation, when they were first launched forth in the sky, continue in force at the present day; and so constant, indeed, and uniform are the influences which govern the several members of the solar system, that the astronomer, in our times, can ascertain what must have been the place and relative position of each at every hour which has passed since the creation of our earth. But it admits not of doubt, on the other hand, that in relation to the great facts of geology, causes have been employed by the Almighty, of which we can now hardly detect the traces among physical agents; and that they must have acted too, upon a scale so immense as to preclude all resemblance to the ordinary effects which have fallen under the observation of the philosopher in later periods. We allude particularly to the powers of solution and detrition in the aqueous fluid which is supposed to have surrounded the infant globe, and which appear a necessary *postulatum* to enable the geologist to account for the formation of the secondary or transition strata, and even of those horizontal beds of sedimentary rocks which have succeeded the more ancient depositions. In a word, we see not in operation, at the present era of our globe, any class of physical powers which we might carry back with us in our inquiries into the natural history of the land and water, and use as the means of ascertaining the process by which the frame-work of this planet was originally constructed under the eye of Omnipotence.

These considerations, it is very obvious, must repress every tendency towards sanguine hope of ever seeing a satisfactory theory of the earth. We admit that the power of volcanoes is so great as to exceed all calculation derived from our experience in every department of artificial dynamics. We grant too, that the rush of water in submarine currents may have the effect of wearing down granitic mountains, and of thereby providing materials for the stratified rocks which appear to have been formed from the *debris* of older formations. But notwithstanding these concessions,

there remains the appalling difficulty connected with the undeniable fact, that the principal phenomena of geology have been produced by a partial deviation from the ordinary laws of nature; by violent disruptions; by the bursting asunder the adamantine zones of the earth; by a supernatural elevation of its waters; and even, it is supposed, by a temporary suspension of its astronomical properties. In short, we have *revolutions* to account for by means of ordinary laws and principles. We have to subject to the arbitration of rules, drawn from the experience of uninterrupted order and peace, certain momentous events which either preceded the regular constitution of the globe, as we now see it, or were brought to pass during a suspension of its power. It is therefore extremely doubtful whether the most complete knowledge of the mineral structure of the earth will ever lead to satisfactory information, in respect to the proximate causes of those convulsions which it must ever be the main object of a geological theory to explain.

We are not ignorant that all the hypotheses which have been submitted to the world on this interesting subject, do not imply the same degree of violent action on the shell of the earth, nor require an equally protracted deviation from the ordinary procedure of those physical causes which the Almighty employs as the ministers of his will. We shall have occasion by and by to illustrate the distinction now stated; meantime we go on to give some account of the work now before us, and of the very important object which the author professes to have in view.

Dr. Ure, we find, although he is described in the title-page of his book as Professor of Physics and Lecturer on Chemistry in the Andersonian *University*, is the head teacher of a Mechanics' Institution at Glasgow, founded between twenty and thirty years ago for the instruction of the lower orders of the people in that manufacturing city. Perceiving that good morals and religious belief do not keep pace with the progress of knowledge among the operative classes, he has resolved, as far as he can, to *Christianize* science, and thereby to lead his auditors, through the study of nature, up to nature's God. He reminds us that the agency of sceptical principles is no longer restricted, as before the French Revolution, to the upper sphere of speculative *savans*.

" Their grosser particles have settled down among the lower grades of society; they are disseminated in the trade-wind of periodicals, and have converted many a workshop and cottage, erewhile scenes of honest industry and quiet, into arenas of deceit, misrule and intemperance. Beings thus perverted with the pride of corrupt doctrines, lose all relish for pure knowledge. They turn a deaf ear to the charms of divine philosophy, however wisely she may charm. These are a few of the misera-

ble trophies of antitheism; these the fruits of a little learning, divorced from its divine origin and end.—To stem this torrent, by forcibly raising mounds in its way, would be a useless labour. We must remount to its sources, and give them a wiser and a safer direction. We must lead the lofty streams of science into the legitimate channels wherein they will flow without disastrous inundation, and spread happiness and fertility on every side. Thus they may once more become the waters of life, refreshing its labours here, and guiding it onwards to the regions of a blessed eternity. Placed for a quarter of a century at the head of the parent seminary for diffusing science among the people, and an eye-witness of many of the evils above described, it will not, I presume, be deemed unbecoming my character and functions if I shall humbly endeavour to draw forth the accordances of science and revelation in the structure and revolutions of our globe. May I indulge the hope of strengthening by this means the faith of the pious, and of removing many chimerical obstructions in the path of truth, so as to enable the candid student to discard his turbulent doubts, and to find ‘joy and peace in believing.’”

We have here a remarkable testimony as to the ambiguous nature of that gift which is now so generally conferred upon the labouring class, by means of which, as the author expresses it, the names of Newton, Laplace, Lavoisier and Davy have everywhere become household words. The plodding mechanic fancies himself suddenly grown an adept in dynamics, and the apprentice-boy a master of statical problems. That knowledge is power has become a trite observation, but it is not always remembered that, like other instruments, it may be used for bad as well as for good; and hence arises the necessity of laying the foundation of all scientific acquirements in sound religious principle, and of rearing the structure, too, in subordination to those higher interests which respect the peace of society and the eternal welfare of the individuals whom we may have undertaken to instruct. We find from some scattered notices in the Introduction to this *New System of Geology*, that the master manufacturers of Glasgow begin to have doubts in regard to the benefit derived by their workmen from attendance upon lectures. He tells us that for several years the proprietors of the great factories encouraged the attendance of their journeymen and apprentices, and frequently distributed tickets of admission to the most deserving, under a conviction that both their dispositions and talents were thereby improved. About the beginning of 1820 a general schism between the masters and workmen, occasioned, we believe, by the new views taken by the latter on the subject of the Combination Laws, extended through all the manufacturing districts of the kingdom; and it so happened that at the same period measures were adopted for founding Mechanics’ Institutions in all our larger towns, and for giving



efficiency to such other means as might be devised for popularizing even the most abstract of the sciences. "This coincidence in time," says Dr. Ure, "afforded, unluckily, a colour for ascribing to philosophy the spirit of misrule and irreligion which then took possession of many minds previously docile and pious." But he does not conceal, that, under the pretence of expounding to students the elements of mechanical and astronomical science, some teachers insidiously undermined the principles of natural and revealed religion, and thereby promoted the desire, too common in all conditions of men, of emancipating the conscience from the controul of an omniscient witness and an unerring Judge. Thus were the schools of philosophy rendered to a great and interesting body of our countrymen the "pest-houses of morals." He speaks too of pseudo-philanthropists, who, reviling the doctrines of faith, and renouncing the powers of the world to come, place scorners in the chairs of philosophy, and thereby pave the way for the introduction of atheism and crime.

Removed as we are from all practical acquaintance with the scenes described by Dr. Ure, and guided only by certain theoretical notions on the inexpediency of habituating the popular mind to speculations of so refined a nature, we were not prepared to hear, as a matter of deep complaint in one of the most populous of our cities, that "the spirit of misrule and irreligion has, in fact, taken possession of many minds previously docile and pious." Such information, coming from such a quarter, ought not to be treated lightly. No one, we presume, has had better opportunities than Dr. Ure of ascertaining the effect of speculative research on the minds of the working class; and if he who has been for a quarter of a century at the head of the parent seminary for diffusing science among the people, proclaims the danger which may attend its progress, and announces himself as "an eye-witness of many of the evils above described," it certainly behoves the guardians of public morals to exert their most earnest endeavours to prevent this divorce between religion and learning from becoming permanent.

So much for the motives which have induced the Professor of Physics in the Andersonian University to put forth a *New System of Geology*. He thinks that he has detected "certain intrinsic sources of change" in the constitution of the earth which seem to have escaped the observation of philosophers; and he feels that he is actuated by the wish to lead "popular students" to the moral and religious uses of their knowledge. His objects are therefore entitled to unqualified praise; but we regret to add that our eulogy can extend no farther, for his book will be found, when minutely examined, to be as little friendly to true science and re-

vealed religion as any work that has hitherto issued from the geological schools of France or of Germany.

In the present state of our knowledge regarding those physical causes which have been employed in altering from time to time, and in finally modifying the external features of the globe, the greatest favour that can be conferred upon theology is to abstain from attaching to its inspired Record all conclusions derived merely from geological research, whether as applied to the structure of the earth, or to the organic fossils which its several strata are found to contain. This branch of study is much too imperfect, and its results as yet possess too little precision, to entitle it to rank as an ally of revealed truth. In process of time the industry and zeal which are expended upon this field of inquiry, may perhaps produce such a return of knowledge as to afford an additional illustration of the Scriptural narrative; in which case the science of mineral combinations may take its place with astronomy, anatomy and chemistry, and be referred to as a system of causes and effects, of means and ends, of objects and contrivances, resting upon principles fully ascertained, and capable of being applied to the elucidation of the Divine attributes. But in the incipient state of discovery in which we now view it, where facts are opposed to facts, and the conclusions of one author refute the reasonings of another, we disclaim, in the name of religion, all alliance with systematic geology. In adopting this defensive policy, too, we make no exception in favour of any particular sect. Huttonians and Wernerians, Neptunists, Plutonists and Vulcanists, are equally objects of our suspicion when they come with the plausible profession in their mouths of *reconciling the great revolutions of the earth to modern science and sacred history*. First let them ascertain the precise nature and extent of the said revolutions, the causes in which they originated, the effects which they have produced, the ends which they were meant to serve, and the time at which they happened; and having collected a few facts which cannot be disputed, let them compare their conclusions with the Mosaical history, and we shall assure them of a perfect agreement between philosophy and sacred writ. The time was when even the alliance of astronomy, that most magnificent and perfect of the sciences, would have proved injurious to religion, because it was not yet sufficiently understood to be made consistent with the great principles of physical truth. The same remark applies to every other subject of human pursuit in its earlier and less mature condition; and hence it is manifest that the advocate for revelation acts wisely when he insists upon a separate line of evidence, and refuses the suspicious aid of scientific deduction, as a ground for belief in the heavenly oracles which he has received.

The philosopher, too, will profit by the freedom which accompanies an independent research. In pursuing the footsteps of nature through the labyrinth of physical causes, he ought to have no other object, in the first instance, than to follow resolutely wherever she may lead; being satisfied that, if he do not miss her traces in the darkness of her remoter paths, he will at length find himself on ground, whence he will perceive, at one glance, the harmony of all her operations, and their perfect consistency with the announcements of Sacred Scripture. The only boon required of him by the student of revealed truth, is to refrain from drawing conclusions until he shall have finished his investigation on a large scale, or have seen his science attain to fixed principles, established on the ground of an indisputable induction. In a word, the alliance between religion and science must be spontaneous, and their fitness for each other must be perceived by the least penetrating eye, before any attempt be made to join them. As long as they require to be *reconciled*, it is better that they should stand apart; for if the endeavour to accomplish that object do not succeed, a serious injury will be inflicted on both. For this reason we view with less apprehension the amazing facts brought to light by Saussure, Buckland and Cuvier, when they are stated simply as discoveries which the science of future ages may, perhaps, be able to explain, than when we see them placed in contact with the Mosaical narrative, and adduced by unwise friends of revelation as a proof that the son of Amram wrote by Divine inspiration. It has often been remarked that there are in the scientific world more false facts than false theories, numerous as the latter are acknowledged to be; and this is another reason why the promoters of philosophy and of revealed religion should occupy different routes as long as they are employed in the search for evidence, and show no haste to join each other until their tracks naturally converge to the same point at the end of their journey.

These remarks have been suggested by a pretty extensive acquaintance with geological hypotheses, as well from the pens of those who were indifferent to the effect of their speculations on religious belief, as from those more cautious writers who laboured to conciliate the feelings of their readers by an attempt to confine their conclusions within the bounds of the established faith. We are satisfied that they are all so far from being consistent with the Mosaical cosmogony literally understood, that every attempt to combine their principles must proceed either from ignorance, or from a wish to deceive. Even the work now before us assumes the existence of secondary causes and a succession of phenomena for which there is not the slightest authority in the book of Genesis. If it be said that an examination of the earth's surface sup-

plies the most indubitable evidence that such causes must have acted, and that such effects must have been produced, our answer is, that as there is no allusion to them in sacred history, they ought not to be brought forward as possessing the remotest claim to a divine sanction. It may be that there are appearances in the structure of the globe which cannot be reconciled to the brief narrative of creation presented in the Pentateuch; and if this be the fact, it is clear that we are thereby furnished with a still stronger reason for keeping the study of geology separate from theological commentary, and from mixing the opinions of an infant science with the dictates of inspiration. Nay, it is possible that the mineralogical history of the earth records many events with which Moses was unacquainted, and which it was not the intention of the Holy Spirit to make known to the simple people to whom the ancient Scriptures were first addressed. In the department of astronomy the most scrupulous divines have not hesitated to admit a similar supposition, and even to acknowledge that the Lawgiver of the Jews may have been ignorant of the magnitude, the revolution and immense distance of the planetary bodies. In this case every one will agree with Rosenmüller, that it would be absurd to object that the Sacred Scriptures thus lead men into error; for this objection could have no weight unless it was the design of those Scriptures to instruct mankind in *Astronomy*, which no one will readily suppose. We maintain, in like manner, that it was not the design of the Bible to teach men *Geology*; and hence, as it would have been foolish to have recourse to the book of Genesis to discover an authority for the Ptolemaic or the Copernican system of the stars, so is it absurd at the present day to employ the statements of Moses in support of Hutton's speculations or Cuvier's conjectures. Rosenmüller has well observed in respect to certain modern philosophers, that "eo delapsi sunt, ut *systemata recentiorum physicorum* in Mose quærerent, et verba miserè ad opiniones suas præconceptas detorquerent."

Were we in want of farther illustration of the dangerous practice adopted by those who seek the elements of scientific truth in the pages of the Old Testament, and twist the words of the inspired writer to coincide with their own opinions and with the systems of recent philosophers, we should go, not to the volumes of sceptical writers either in our own country or elsewhere, but to the pious labours of some of our most ardent and conscientious believers. In the work of Granville Penn, for example, of which the main object is to establish the Mosaical geology on the ruins of the various systems of mineral geology, we find the bold assertion that the heavenly luminaries were not *created* on the fourth day,

but were then only rendered *manifest*, or visible—a freedom with the inspired narrative not exceeded by the wildest dreams of Buffon or Demaillet. He employs similar *postulata* as the basis of his whole theory, without any appearance of authority in the Sacred Writings; and as the views of Mr. Penn are nearly the same which are embodied in the *new system* of Dr. Ure, we shall exhibit an outline of them in the following quotation:—

“In the first production of the mineral globe no *secondary* causes could have acted, because secondary causes could not exist until the *first formations* in which they were to reside had received existence. But as soon as a first formation was produced, its laws received their force; subject always to the controul and determination of their Divine Author. In the *first act* of creation this mineral globe was produced *at once*, compact, solid and complete, in all its *mineral* nature, order and composition; and as the first tree received its various *successive folds*, apparently, but not necessarily or really indicative of succession in time, so the *shell* of the earth received its various *successive primitive strata*, apparently, but not really indicative of such succession; both being essential to the ends for which they were respectively formed. From that moment the globe was subjected to its proper laws.”

At this stage the mineral conformation of the earth is supposed to have been complete; but the sea still covered the whole of its surface, and flowed round it in what Mr. Penn calls an “illimitable abyss.” To prepare a place for the water, therefore, it became necessary to *undo* a great part of the “nature, order and composition of the successive primitive strata.”

“In causing the violent *disruption* and *depression* of that part of the solid surface which was to form a bed for the sea, the new laws and agencies of the mineral globe were rendered operative by their Almighty Creator, but by the rule of his own creative plan. The solid *frame-work* or *skeleton* of the globe was therefore burst, fractured and subverted by those agencies, and according to those laws, at the will of the Legislator, in all those parts where *depression* was to produce the *profundity*; and it carried down with it, in apparent confusion, vast and extensive portions of the materials or soils which had been regularly disposed and compacted upon it; leaving other portions partially dislocated and variously distorted from their primitive positions. So that the orders of the materials of the globe, which in the reserved, unaltered and exposed portion retained their first position and arrangement, were broken, displaced, and apparently confounded in the other portion which was to receive within it the accumulated waters. The *primitive mineral formations* were thus early interrupted and disordered in their continuity even upon the third day of their creation, and therefore anterior to the existence of any organized beings.”—“Among the secondary agencies either employed in producing or necessarily accompanying this *tremendous primitive revolution* of the mineral globe, we may assume the power and agency of *volcanic expansion and explosion*; by which, acting with

extraordinary and extensive effect, a vast portion of the crust of the solid sphere would have become suddenly transformed from its native state into a condition of laceration and apparent ruin. We know that the admission of water to the subterraneous fires which are constituent within the system of this earth, produces volcanic action as a physical consequence; and the *fiat* of God, which by disruption gave extensive admission for the incumbent waters into the interior of the newly constituted earth, would have been followed by explosion equally extensive, in consequence of the provision of His own laws."

While the reader examines the above extract, let him not forget that it was written by an author who expresses the utmost indignation against all hypotheses on the subject of cosmogony, and denounces as an enemy to revealed religion every mineralogist who dares to suggest that certain additions might be innocently made to the literal statement of the Mosaical record. Where shall we find greater liberties than are taken by Mr. Penn with the first chapter of Genesis? After telling us that this "mineral globe was produced solid, compact and complete in all its mineral nature, order and composition," he proceeds to relate that on the third day thereafter, a large portion of it was reduced to a "condition of laceration and apparent ruin!"—that "the solid framework or skeleton of the earth was burst, fractured and subverted!"—and that this "tremendous primitive revolution carried down in apparent confusion vast portions of the materials which had been regularly disposed and compacted!" Where, we beg leave to ask, in the whole range of the Mosaical geology, as Mr. Penn is pleased to call it, shall we discover any traces of that *volcanic expansion and explosion* which gave a new form to the globe when it was only two days old, and tore asunder its primitive strata a few hours after they were first consolidated? It is not without reason, therefore, that we refuse the co-operation of those philosophers who undertake to reconcile the great revolutions of the earth to modern science and sacred history, and to shed upon the inspired narrative a light derived from recent discoveries in geological principles.

We have already hinted that Dr. Ure follows very closely, in the outlines of his hypothesis, the notions of Mr. Granville Penn. In truth the Andersonian professor of physics has committed a slight mistake in giving to his book the title of a *New System of Geology*, inasmuch as it contains nothing either novel or systematic. It is a mere compilation from very common treatises, his obligations to which are for the most part duly acknowledged. He pretends to no higher rank than that of a cabinet mineralogist; while as to the more difficult branch of geognostic research, he refers his readers to those laborious writers who have scaled the



summit of mountains and gone down to the bowels of the earth, who have inspected the formations of either hemisphere, and made themselves acquainted with every form which mountain rocks are known to assume. He presents no original observations, no new descriptions, no unexpected combinations, no interesting details. He has not detected the existence of any unwonted succession in the stratified minerals, nor of any unknown ingredients in the composition of the central masses upon which they rest. His leading object has been to distribute the most entertaining and best established truths, illustrative of the structure and revolutions of the earth, in the order of their physical connections and causes. He has endeavoured "to arrange multifarious and seemingly discordant facts into a chain of natural links," and in executing this task he has, he admits, "drawn freely from every source of geological knowledge within his reach."

Confining our estimate of Dr. Ure's performance, therefore, to his functions as an historiographer, we will endeavour to show that he has not succeeded in arranging the multifarious and apparently discordant facts supplied by others into a chain of natural links; but, on the contrary, that he has assumed the existence of physical causes which do not explain the phenomena which he attributes to their operation, and, secondly, that he has described geological events which there is no reason to believe could have occurred within the limits of the period to which he has restricted his inquiry.

We maintain, in the first place, that the physical causes which he has assumed do not explain the geological facts which he ascribes to their operation. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that the primitive crust of the globe consisted of concentric strata of gneiss, mica-slate, and clay-slate, with partial layers of semicrystalline limestone, and moreover that these strata no longer lie in beds concentric with the terraqueous spheroid, but are thrown up into nearly vertical planes and transpierced in many parts by towering masses of granite and porphyry, we, nevertheless, deny that the cause assigned for this change could have produced it. The cause alluded to is nearly the same as that specified by Mr. Penn for his disruptions and lacerations of the primeval globe; namely, volcanic action occasioned by the admission of water to the metallic bases of the several earths and alkalis. Dr. Ure reminds us that silicon, aluminum, calcium, magnesium, potassium, and iron are combustible elements, a mixture of which, at common temperatures, coming into contact with water or moist air, would cause fire and explosion. That these substances exist at a moderate depth below the surface of the earth, in the state of simple combustibles, he does not hesitate to

assert, on the ground that the phenomena of volcanoes and earthquakes cannot be otherwise accounted for. The heat, too, observed in subterraneous regions, progressively increasing as we descend, renders it farther probable, he thinks, that these combustible elements exist there in a fluid state; an effect which would result from a very moderate heat; one greatly inferior to what is requisite for the fusion of their oxides.

"We therefore conclude that the primordial earth as it lay beneath the circumfused abyss, was at first endowed with concentric coats of gneiss, mica-slate, and other primitive schists; that at the recorded command of the Almighty, a general eruption and protrusion of the granitic, syenitic, porphyritic, and other unstratified rocks took place, which broke up and elevated the schists into nearly vertical planes, similar to what now exist, leaving commensurate excavations for the level of the sea."

In short, the substance of the hypothesis is, that horizontal layers of slaty or other stratified bodies originally composed the outer parts of the globe, somewhat in the way that an onion is formed; and that the earth continued to possess this regular formation, until it became necessary to provide a basin for the sea; at which period a great volcanic action, excited, it is said, at a certain depth under the surface, hove up the mountains, dislocated the super-incumbent strata, and thereby scooped up hollows for the congregated waters. Now, passing over the improbability that Divine Wisdom would proceed in a manner so inconsistent with foresight, as not to comprehend in the original scheme of our planet, a channel for the great deep, we deny that there is any authority in the analogy of nature for supposing that the oxidation of the metallic bases of the earths and alkalis would produce granite. All the knowledge supplied by experience, and by the minutest examination of volcanic districts tends to disprove such an hypothesis; for in no part of the world does the operation of internal fire on mineral substances produce a rock, bearing any resemblance to those granitic masses which are seen to support the primitive strata of the globe in both hemispheres. It is the boast of our author, that he can explain the revolutions which have taken place in the earth by a reference to causes which are still in activity; but he has not given an example from among the two hundred volcanoes which are at present burning in Europe, America, and Asia of one *coulée*, or stream of lava, consolidating into granite or even into porphyry. We hear of currents of basalt flowing on all sides, to the distance of twenty or thirty miles, accompanied with clinkstone, volcanic tufas, and with cellular and scoriform lavas; but although some of the cones ascend to an elevation of more than 15,000 feet above the

level of the sea, one of which too presents a crater eight miles in circumference, we are not told of any which raise from the bed of the ocean a granitic chain, like that of the Cordillera in the one continent, or like the Himalayan ridge in the other. We repeat, therefore, that the action of the most powerful volcanoes, that at present exist on the face of the earth, do not exhibit such results as would justify us in concluding, that the primeval mountains of the globe were raised up from the abyss by a similar agency.

But a still stronger argument against the supposition, that the appearances presented by the primitive strata are owing to the disruptive and lacerating action of internal fire, may be derived from the regular and uniform *direction* of the stratified rocks in all parts of the world. In examining mountain-formations on a large scale, there are two circumstances which deserve attention in the character of strata—their *inclination* and their *direction*. The former is measured by the angle which the slope of a bed or stratum forms with the plane of the horizon; the latter has respect to the points of the compass towards which the length of the strata extends, which, we need scarcely add, are usually in the direction of the mountain range itself. Observations made in the Alps, in the environs of Genoa, in the Fichtelberge, and in the Cordillera of Venezuela, induced M. Humboldt to regard the planes of the stratification of the earth, as forming an angle of about  $52^{\circ}$  with its meridian sections. On comparing all the observations of this kind made in France, Switzerland, Germany, Norway, and Scotland, philosophers have recognised a pretty general direction from west-south-west to east-north-east.

It is extremely difficult to believe, that an effect at once so general and so uniform, could have been produced by a cause so capricious as that of volcanic agency. Indeed it is not possible for us to conceive that an eruption from beneath of granitic, syenitic or porphyritic rocks, tearing the strata and throwing many of them into a vertical position, could have left them in a state of such regularity, that in every land under heaven, the direction of their planes should be almost entirely the same. Dr. Ure, indeed, tells us that from the shoulders and flanks of the stupendous granite peaks, mantles of gneiss and mica-slate depend in magnificent drapery. These schistose coverings, he adds, are arranged near the summit in folds almost upright, which lower down become sloped off with clayslate and limestone into a gentle declivity. But this observation, which has a closer affinity to his particular views than to geological accuracy, must not be understood to affect the general principle applicable to stratified

rocks, and which determines their *direction* in all the great mountain ranges hitherto approached by the adventurous curiosity of man.

The strongest point of the Wernerian hypothesis, in our opinion, rests upon the regular succession and uniform arrangement of the primitive strata. To one who has observed the order and appearance of these universal deposits, it seems much more probable that their properties, the same in all parts of the earth, should be the result of causes which have long operated in tranquillity, than that they should owe their present aspect to the violent action of a principle, which is distinguished more by the variety than by the uniformity of its effects. Our feelings sustain less violence, when we are called upon to believe that those immense formations, occupying the greater portion of the globe, and exhibiting every where the same qualities, were produced by a process of crystallization amid the waters of the primeval sea, than when we hear it maintained that the present crust of the globe is a ruin, torn and dispersed by furious explosions, occasioned by the admission of water into metallic combustibles in the bowels of our planet.

It is worthy of remark, too, that neither Mr. Penn nor Dr. Ure, has thought it necessary to inform us of the means by which the water of the ocean was admitted to the *silicum*, *aluminum*, *calcium*, *magnesium*, and *potassium*, in all parts of the globe at the same time, so as to throw up mountains of granite and porphyry. A certain degree of disruption in the shell of the earth must have taken place *before* the volcanic action could be excited; and as there are hills and seas in every region under heaven, the bursting of the strata, in order to admit the water to the combustible metaloids, must have been almost universal, prior to the operation itself which is said to have caused the tearing asunder of the great mineral beds. This essential point is not once brought under consideration. We are merely informed that Divine Wisdom found it expedient to provide a basin for the waters, which, during the first and second days, covered the whole globe; and that this object was accomplished, in the course of the third day, by turning up a large portion of the horizontal strata on their edges, the means employed being explosion from beneath. So happily are the great revolutions of the earth reconciled to sacred history!

A child, upon listening to this wise hypothesis, would naturally ask whether the raising of mountains on the face of a plain, would make a hollow for receiving the water which is said to have covered the whole of that plain. If there were not a subsidence as well as an elevation, the water would only stand

deeper on the plain than it did before, because the surface which it had formerly occupied being narrowed, the level of the fluid must necessarily rise. A mountain raised by an explosive force does not imply a corresponding valley; and hence, with all his apparatus of assumed physical causes, Dr. Ure has not succeeded in forming either land or sea. We have the greater reason, moreover, to condemn his failure in this attempt, because he was under no necessity to encounter the difficulty; it being an article of his geological creed, that the "present earth has resulted from definite creative *Fiats*, and not from the progressive operation of any mere physical forces whatsoever." Why then did he not rest satisfied with the simple, the sublime, the unembarrassed statement of Moses; "And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good?" There is no difficulty here. The sacred historian takes it for granted, that there was a basin or hollow on the surface of the globe unto which the waters could be gathered together; and does not insinuate, after the manner of his Allies in the present day, that it was necessary to begin a process of *explosion* and *disruption* before the Divine intentions could be fulfilled!

The next step in the theory is, to explain the origin of the transition rocks, to which the ingenious author proceeds in the following manner:—

"The erection of the subaqueous strata into the primitive mountains and plains was evidently accompanied with universal disruption. Innumerable fragments of both the upborne and upbearing rocks were tossed about and washed down into the congregated waters, along the precipitous shores and over the bed of the primeval ocean. These shattered fragments becoming agglutinated by their own pulverulent cement, soon recomposed continuous strata, which bear internal evidence of the violence which gave them birth. Thus were formed the *transition* rocks of geologists, mineral masses which denote the passage between the upright primitive, and the horizontal secondary strata, between those of inorganic and organic evidence. These rocks are called conglomerate or fragmentary, from their aspect and composition. In the course of the reunion and consolidation of their parts, a few of the organic forms with which the sea was beginning to teem, falling into their crevices, became imbedded in their substance. Here we see how some vestiges of animal existence appear in the oldest conglomerate or greywacke formation. The convulsions which, after a long period, caused the deluge, have also dislocated many of these conglomerates, so that strata of rounded pebbles assuredly aggregated in a horizontal position, are now found standing in upright walls. It is therefore demonstrable, that these puddingstone

strata were formed in horizontal or slightly inclined beds, and erected after their accretion. Such effects would be produced on the convulsive emergence of the pebbly banks out of the primeval ocean, either at the Deluge or some preceding catastrophe. There are mountains 10,000 feet high in the Alps, formed of firmly conglomerated pebbles. It will be proper to introduce here a general view of the order in which the mineral strata were progressively built up during the antediluvian period, under that ocean 'whose bed laid dry by the last great revolution now forms all the countries at present inhabited.' "

Here we find this advocate for Scriptural verity introducing into his system convulsions and revolutions altogether unknown to the Mosaical narrative! In reviewing the doctrines of Hutton and Werner, Dr. Ure gives way to the most furious indignation against the licentiousness of theorists who, not satisfied with the record of creative energy and divine *fiats*, profanely suggest the employment of physical causes and a progressive operation of the laws of nature, with the view of explaining some of the more recent orders of geological phenomena. But in the above extract he boldly adopts the very expedient which he condemns in others. He imagines a series of geological catastrophes between the creation and the flood, the "emergence of pebbly banks out of the primeval ocean," long after the Hexämeron had passed away; the projection from the deep of strata containing "vestiges of animal existence;" and "convulsions which dislocated the conglomerates" and changed them from a horizontal to an upright position—for all which in the book of Genesis there is not the remotest shade of authority. We question not the geological facts, nor dispute the accuracy of the science by the principles of which he endeavours to account for them; but we unhesitatingly condemn the inconsistency of an author who denounces the use of hypothesis in former writers, while he himself employs it without any restraint and to the full extent of his wants. He admits that the rocks, replete with marine remains, and which of course must have been formed under the level of the ocean, long after the land and the water were separated by the divine *fiat*, are spread over two-thirds of the surface of every part of our continents which have been explored. They abound, he adds, at great elevations; rising to the loftiest summits of the Pyrenees, nearly 11,000 feet above the level of our present ocean, and to still loftier points in the Andes.

"It is remarkable, (we use his own words,) that the true geographical summits of the Pyrenean ridge are composed of secondary shell-limestones, which surpass the granite, gneiss, and mica-slates in elevation, and may have been deposited over the primitive rocks, while they stood under the primeval ocean. In fact, the secondary rocks, red sandstone,



alpine limestone, limestone of the Jura order, and trap, cover the primitive and transition rocks of the Pyrenees."

Every geologist knows that the strata of shell-limestone could only be formed in the ocean after the creation of mollusca and other tenants of the waters had taken place, and, consequently, that the Pyrenees and the Andes could not have been raised above the waves at that memorable epoch when, according to Dr. Ure, the mountains and the dry land generally were elevated by the explosive force of metallic combustibles. At what period then, and by what means were the Pyrenees and the Cordillera of the western continent projected into middle air, and constituted so principal a part of the framework or skeleton of the globe? The physical causes assumed by the author do not enable him to explain such an occurrence. The Mosaical record does not acknowledge those repeated "emergencies" of continents from the bosom of the ocean, bearing on their summits the most indisputable evidence that their strata must have been formed subsequently to the era of animal creation. Whatever the exigencies of geological investigation may demand, certain we are that the sacred history does not require such a latitude of interpretation. It has been insinuated, we are aware, by certain advocates for inspired truth that the whole of the land occupied by the contemporaries of Noah was submerged at the deluge, and is at this moment the basin of the Pacific or of the Southern Atlantic: but Dr. Ure, enlightened by the discoveries of the *Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*, is in possession of the most satisfactory proof, that the principal mountain tracts of Europe and of America must have been, before the Flood, surrounded by various tribes of animals, the fossil remains of which enrich the Museums of modern times. We therefore repeat that he recognizes the existence of geological events, which there is no reason to believe could possibly have occurred within the limits of the period to which he has restricted his inquiry.

This is the second point which we undertook to establish; but before we proceed to this new branch of our argument, we think it right to state, in the author's own words, the result to which he imagines himself to have attained, through the medium of modern science and of ancient history.

1. "That a great proportion of the present dry land, more particularly the secondary strata, which are replete with sea shells of the most delicate texture, distributed entire in regular beds, *have lain for a long period at the bottom of the primeval ocean.*

2. "That within the schistose crust of the globe, explosive materials exist, which have given evidence of their convulsive and disruptive

powers in all its terraqueous regions and in every age of the world, from the protrusion of the primordial dry land till the present day.

3. "That the ocean, at whose bottom many of our present earthy strata were deposited, has not been lessened by dissipation of its waters into celestial space, or by their absorption into the bowels of the earth.

4. "That, therefore, its channel must have been changed by transference of a great portion at least of its waters from their ancient to their present basin; an effect referable to volcanic agency, which has operated by sinking the old lands and upheaving the new."

The reader of Dr. Ure's book cannot fail to observe that, in speaking of the changes which took place upon the geological properties of the globe between the era of creation and the deluge, he uniformly employs the ambiguous phrases of "antediluvian world," or "antediluvian period," as if he meant to restrict the operation of the physical causes by means of which those changes were brought about, to the 1656 years authorized by the Hebrew chronology. Now, if his theory has any consistency at all, we must believe it to be his intention to teach that all the secondary and tertiary strata were formed during the limited time now specified; and also that the continents and larger islands which are now inhabited by the human race, were for some centuries between the days of Adam and of Noah, covered with the waters of the ocean. The first land which was protruded by volcanic agency must, he acknowledges, have been very barren, bearing a great resemblance to the mountainous part of Wales, or to the highlands of Scotland; and yet, with an air of confidence which appears to rest on no good ground, he assures us that the first age of the world, extending probably through several hundreds of years, fully realized the universal and unfading spring of the poets. But the tremendous catastrophes of the crust of the earth that took place soon after this period, generated, says he, "a vast quantity of *detritus* from the older rocks, which at first diffused through a turbid ocean progressively subsided on its bottom in the chemical order of deposition; constituting beds of conglomerate limestone, red marl, and lias, varying in thickness and extent, according to the nature of the exploded and comminuted rocks." After a series of such tremendous catastrophes, and the formation of our present land from the broken pieces of primitive and transition strata, our portion of the earth was heaved up to the light of day, sometime we may conjecture, towards the end of the first millennium, or about the marriage of Lamech, the father of Noah. It is true that no notice is taken by the sacred historian of such a trifling occurrence as the elevation of Europe, Asia, and America from the bottom of the sea, or of the emergence of the Alps and the Andes with their patches of

tertiary rocks, beds of gravel, and strata of shell limestone. Noah, it is probable, was a young man when the island of Great Britain came up with its coal, chalk, and flint; and as he is supposed to have lived somewhere in that extensive country which is now covered with the Pacific Ocean, the news of such an insignificant phenomenon may not have reached him. At all events, there is no allusion in the inspired record to the mighty changes which Dr. Ure imagines to have taken place, among the antediluvian parents of the human race.

With a similar regard for the authority which he wishes to establish among his students in relation to the Mosaical narrative, he speaks of *mighty revolutions* which must have occasioned many "unrecorded inundations" before the universal deluge; and assures them that we "have every physical reason to conclude that each great antediluvian convulsion of the earth extended the empire of the sea, and abridged the boundaries of the land by a permanent submersion of some of its regions." These *submersions*, it is true, have been equally neglected in the book of Genesis with the elevation of the present dry land from the antediluvian sea; but this is no reason, we presume, for indulging the slightest doubt that both the one and other did take place, at some period in the life of Methuselah. The explosions and disruptions were still going on, supplying materials for new strata, or upheaving those which were already consolidated; and this process, we are informed by the author, bore some resemblance to the blasting of stones by gunpowder, a moderate charge of which under a stratum of freestone in a cliff, will be adequate merely to lift it along with its superjacent soil, whereas a greater quantity will break it into pieces and strew the detritus over the surrounding plain. The progress of our inquiries, says he, proves the globe in those times to have been the frequent subject of mighty convulsions, which have disturbed the strata over an extent prodigiously greater than the explosions of modern earthquakes and volcanoes could give us any reason to conceive. "It is certain that the sea must have participated in the violence under which the solid earth has evidently suffered. Irruptions of the waters over the land would unquestionably occur at every new crisis of the eruptive power so conspicuous in the coal measures and basaltic formations. He does not attempt to conceal from his youthful readers that a great portion of the waters of the ocean have been transferred from their ancient to their present basin, and that this was effected "by volcanic agency which has operated by sinking the old lands and upheaving the new."

"This transflux of the ocean could not be effected unquestionably without the most violent fractures and dislocations of the terrestrial

crust. Of the disorders and even metamorphoses of the earth's surface coincident with these great changes of the sea channel, geology furnishes innumerable proofs in mountain, valley, and plain. Many of these eruptive phenomena indicate a succession of catastrophes—an alternation of marine and fresh water floods, over no inconsiderable districts of the globe, at a period anterior to the penal cataclysm described by Moses ; the *last and greatest of that convulsive series*. This flood was not partial like its predecessors, which left the contemporaneous breeds of animals alive to be inhumed in the superior beds ; it was manifestly universal, since all the animal remains buried in its detritus belong to species now extinct ; and however closely allied to our existing genera, left no posterity on the earth. As we rise in the order of mineral supposition, or advance in geological terms, we perceive a progressive approximation in the *crisis* so to speak, as well as in the productions of the earth, to its modern condition in these respects. Thus in the lias and oolites up to the chalk, every thing organic speaks plainly of a fervid climate, actuating both the land and waters of these high latitudes of ours. But the *tertiary* strata of England and France bear record to a marked abatement of heat *some time prior to the deluge*."

Examining the above paragraph, under the impression that it comes from the pen of a philosopher who condemns with a loud voice all geological hypotheses which are not perfectly consistent with the writings of Moses, we cannot help expressing our surprise, in the first place, that he should assert in regard to the animals existing before the flood, that they left no posterity on the earth. The inspired historian relates that God commanded Noah to take into the ark a pair of every species of living creatures with the express intention of preserving their races to replenish the desolated globe. "And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee ; they shall be male and female. Of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, and of every creeping thing of the earth after his kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee to keep them alive. And take thou unto thee of all food that is eaten ; and thou shalt gather it to thee ; and it shall be food for thee and for them." There cannot be any thing plainer or more particular than this narrative, and yet Dr. Ure, the great advocate for Scriptural truth and literal interpretation, insinuates that Moses did not mean all he says in the sixth chapter of Genesis, but that we may imagine the preparations for the flood there described, had much the same object as the cares of an ordinary sea officer before he sets out on a long voyage. The earth, he tells us, was very much chilled by the deluge, the soil was rendered very damp, and the air extremely uncomfortable, and hence the necessity of a flesh diet, which was then for the first time permitted to man. Had Noah not provided himself

with an ample and various supply before the rains, he could not it is suggested, have found the means of gratifying his new appetite when he landed on mount Ararat. But the doctor nevertheless seems to impeach his management of the flocks committed to his care, inasmuch as the patriarch must either have neglected the useful creatures which he was directed to save from destruction, or have eaten them all up without any regard to issue or remainder; for it is evident to the geological eye that "Noah's stock died out" in a short time, and made way for an entirely new breed, created on purpose to supply the deficiency. Had the present race of quadrupeds been lineal descendents of the antediluvian, we may ask, says he, whence proceed those specific differences in bony structure, of which no corresponding examples occur among the skeletons of our existing species. Had all our present animal tribes, he repeats, been propagated from the ark which rested on Ararat, or some other lofty mountain in Asia, how comes it that the Kangaroo, echidné, ornithorynchus, and wombats are now confined to New Holland. Those who regard all our actual animals as the offspring of the primeval parents which travelled through the isthmus of the ark, will, he declares, in vain seek for types of our most prolific existing races among those diluvial ruins, where innumerable exuviae of the elephant, the bear, the horse, the ox, the deer are found. It is manifest, therefore, according to the reasoning of this learned head of the Andersonian University, that the animals which Noah collected into the ark were not meant to be "kept alive" but eaten; and moreover that in the list of quadrupeds which travelled through that *isthmus*, there were neither sheep nor goats, antelopes, roebucks, lamas, apes, camels, nor camelopards. We know not whether his "popular students" as he is pleased to denominate the mechanic auditors whom he is supposed to address, will, after such a harangue, leave his lecture room with a profounder respect for the Pentateuch than when they first read it in their simple ignorance. Let us at all events have no more revilings from Glasgow against Hutton, Playfair, and Buffon!

But the main point for our consideration, at this stage of our Review, is the statement made above, that the *tertiary* strata of England and France were in existence prior to the deluge. Nay, he boldly asserts that the more ancient organic remains of the regular secondary and tertiary strata "bear good evidence of having been inurned at a period *long antecedent to the deluge*." But how, or by what means, we demand, were those strata formed, after the work of creation was finished, the human race put in possession of the earth and every thing pronounced "very good?" The secondary and tertiary rocks we are told are composed of the *detritus*, that is, the sand and smaller fragments

of the primitive rocks which were shattered by the volcanic explosions of the third day, and gradually deposited and conglutinated at the bottom of the sea. Now as these strata in England have been ascertained to be about a *mile in thickness*, and consist of sixteen or seventeen different formations which denote, in the language of geology, so many distinct epochs and conditions of the mineral fluid which acted as the menstruum and medium of deposition, we have a right to expect some evidence in support of the hypothesis on which these facts are made to rest. Not only were those strata formed in the antediluvian age, but the process is said to have been completed, and even the tertiary beds, from 2000 to 3000 feet in thickness, raised from the ocean and fitted for the abode of man, at a period *long antecedent* to the deluge. In fact, although the sacred historian mentions that the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them, at the end of the sixth day, the work, according to Dr. Ure, was only beginning, so far at least as this globe was concerned. The only land which was then above water was fit for nothing but briars. "Consisting of primitive formations in the strictest sense of the geological word, it would prove in general a stubborn soil, prolific of every congenial weed, but ungracious to culture:" (a pious commentary on the *very good* of Moses!) and meanwhile, as men were multiplying their transgressions on the surface, rich loamy plains, composed of "red marl, lias, oolite, Oxford clay, chalk marl, plastic clay, and London clay," were forming for them under the muddy waves of the adjacent seas.

Nor was this process confined to a small section of the globe. On the contrary, as strata of the secondary and tertiary classes are found in all parts of the world, and compose in fact, by far the greater proportion of the land which is at present occupied by the human race, we must conclude, according to this theory, that the continents and islands which are in our days above water, were in the earlier years of the antediluvian fathers, at the bottom of the ocean, and raised up some centuries before the deluge. No geologist can have the slightest hesitation to assert that such an hypothesis is untenable in every part; and moreover, that the author, under the semblance of supporting the credit of the Mosaic narrative, exposes it to the most obvious and formidable objections. Does he not lead his readers to conclude that the present part of the inhabitable globe was formed of fragments of the original crust of the earth, dislocated and torn in pieces by subterranean fires, and that this process of formation took place while men were living and multiplying their numbers on some spots of its primitive surface? And does he not thereby admit the inference that the inspired historian was either ignorant of these facts, or purposely meant to conceal them—an opinion



which is utterly at variance with the respect that we owe to the Divine authority of the Pentateuch? Nor is the matter mended by the supposition of "mighty convulsions," "unrecorded inundations," "successions of catastrophes," and "alternations of marine and fresh-water floods." There is no proof of such things in the Book of Genesis; and, besides, as they are not adequate to the production of the effects for which, by means of them, the author attempts to account, his hypothetical liberties only involve him in the double charge of ignorance and of impiety.

It is enough to repeat the remark with which we began, namely, that the conclusions of geology, in its present imperfect state, cannot be reconciled with the Mosaical history of the creation, and therefore that every endeavour to expound the one by a reference to the other must not only fail of success, but expose the studies of geognostic mineralogy and of fossil organic remains to a degree of suspicion, on the part of serious Christians, to which they are not justly liable. From the character of the secondary strata, particularly from their compounded and sedimentary nature, and from the relics which they contain of animal life, there can be no doubt that much of the land which is now above the level of the ocean was once under it; and hence that the soils, from which the existing generations of men derive their food, have been formed from the detrition of older deposits long exposed to the action of water. But there is no ground on which to rest our belief that the process now mentioned has taken place since the earth was first prepared for the habitation of man, or that the results belong to the era of human history. In examining the structure of the globe, we discover manifest proofs of succession in the layers or strata which compose its outer shell—certain stages of the Divine workmanship accomplished by the gradual operation of those physical powers with which matter is endowed—but we are not furnished with the means of determining the distance between any two successive points in the series. These phenomena are all so many marks of the lapse of time, among which the principles of geology enable us to distinguish a certain order, so that we know some of them to be more and others to be less distant, but without being able to ascertain with any exactness the proportion of the immense intervals which separate them. Nor, for the reason formerly mentioned, are we likely ever to arrive at a full knowledge of those causes by which the ancient revolutions of the earth's surface were brought to pass. The thread of operation, as Cuvier expressed it, is broken, the march of nature is changed, and none of the agents which she now employs were sufficient for the production of her ancient works. The depositions which are now made along the shores of the sea, or at the bottoms

of lakes, bear hardly any resemblance to the schistose formations of mica-slate and clay-slate, or of primitive limestone; while the mineral substances which owe their origin to volcanic eruptions have scarcely anything in common with the oldest descriptions of granite and porphyry. Besides, were we to measure the period necessary for depositing the tertiary strata of England and France, extending to nearly two thousand yards in thickness, by the progress of any similar operation which falls under our own eyes, we should be startled by the result of the most moderate calculation. The following abridgement of Cuvier's remarks on the Parisian basin will afford an example of the hypothetical license, both as to time and physical agents, which has been employed in order to explain one of the most recent geological formations.

"On reconsidering these beds from the chalk upwards, we conceive first of all a sea depositing on its bottom an immense mass of chalk, and mollusca of peculiar species. The precipitation of the chalk and of its attendant shells suddenly stops; the sea retires; waters of another kind, very probably analogous to that of our fresh-water lakes, succeed, and all the hollows of the marine formation are filled up with clay, *debris* of land vegetables, and of fresh-water shells. But soon another sea, producing new inhabitants, nourishing a prodigious quantity of testaceous *mollusca*, entirely different from those of the chalk, returns, and covers the clay, its lignites and their shells, to deposit on that basis thick beds, composed in a great degree of the shelly coverings of these new *mollusca*. By degrees this production of shells diminishes, and also comes to an end; the sea withdraws, and the soil is again covered with lakes of fresh water. Alternate strata are formed of gypsum and marl, which envelope both the *debris* of the animals bred in the lakes and the bones of those which lived on their banks. The sea comes back once more; it breeds at first some species of bivalve and turbinate shell-fish, which disappear, and are replaced by oysters. An interval now elapses, during which a great mass of sand is deposited. We are led to believe that no organised bodies lived at that period in this sea or that their exuvæ have been completely destroyed, for none are to be found in the sand-bed. But the varied productions of this third sea re-appear, and we again observe on the summit of Montmartre, the same shells as were found in the marls placed over the gypsum, which, though really different from those of the coarse-grained lime-stone, are still considerably like them. Lastly, the sea withdraws entirely for the third time. Lakes or marshes of fresh water take its place, and cover with the remains of their inhabitants the tops of almost all the hills, and the surfaces also of some of the plains between them."

All these changes of sea and lake, of salt water and of fresh, are described as having taken place before the deluge. "They exhibit," says Dr. Ure, "an unfading picture of the convulsions which the primeval globe suffered a few centuries before its close." But can the learned professor point out any coincidences between

the said picture and the description given by Moses the servant of God? No; and, therefore, we reject his aid as a supporter of revelation on geological principles. His attempt to reconcile the "great revolutions of the earth and animated nature to modern science and sacred history" has done no good, and may do much harm; because he has not only not succeeded in his undertaking, but has surrounded the subject with difficulties which do not belong to it, when studied in a separate and independent form. Well did Bacon remark, that if vain conceits come to be held in veneration, the understanding succumbs as if seized with the plague. "Some moderns," says he, "have indulged in this vanity with so little discretion, that they have endeavoured to establish a body of natural philosophy on the first chapter of Genesis, the Book of Job, and some other of the sacred writings; thus seeking the living among the dead. This vanity merits castigation and restraint the more, as, from the mischievous admixture of divine and human things, there is compounded at once a fanatical philosophy and a heretical religion. It is therefore most salutary, with a sober mind to render to faith what belongs to faith. *Tanto magis hæc vanitas inhibenda venit et coercenda, quia ex divinorum et humanorum male sana admixtione, non solum educitur philosophia phantastica, sed etiam religio heretica. Itaque salutare admodum est, si mente sobria, fidei tantum dentur, quæ fidei sunt.*"

Besides favouring Dr. Ure with our advice to pursue his geological studies on geological grounds, and thereby to abstain from the mischievous admixture of divine and human things, by which both philosophy and religion are injured, we would counsel him to read his Bible with attention before he again ventures into the boundless field of physical speculation. This charity on our part was suggested by a singular fact, which occasioned to us at once amusement and surprise. After some discussion on the theory of dew and rain, he informs the reader that he had adduced his corollaries from the hygrometric laws which respect the constitution of the atmosphere, "*before his attention was drawn to the following curious historical notice of primeval meteorology.*" It affords a very beautiful, and to me quite unexpected accordance between the results of science and the records of faith." We naturally imagined that this "curious historical notice," to which his attention was drawn, had been discovered in some very rare scientific performance of the middle ages, not likely to be met with in the library of the Andersonian University. But upon proceeding, we found that the reference made by his friend was to the second chapter of Genesis, and that the unknown passage—the curious historical notice to which his attention had never before been directed, the unexpected accordance between science and faith—

was this.—“ For the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground. But there went up a mist from the whole earth, and watered the whole face of the ground!”

There are other proofs in his book that Dr. Ure has not read long nor very deeply in those sacred pages which describe the origin of our globe, and present the first outlines of human history. But we find no fault with his defective theology, or his bad rendering of Hebrew (p. 503); we confine our censure to his unwise and unsuccessful attempt to connect things together which have nothing in common, to found on Scripture the wildest conjectures of geology, and to seek a prop for our religious faith in the deductions of a science which is still entirely destitute of fixed principles.

ART. VII.—*The Life and Times of William Laud, D.D. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.* By John Parker Lawson, M.A.  
London: Rivingtons. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 8s.

THERE are perhaps few inquiries attended with more vexation of spirit and weariness of flesh than that which relates to the period of confusion and agony which ended in the establishment of our liberties, and the formation of our constitution. It must be a mighty spirit which, even at this day, should be able, in serene composure, to weigh the pleadings on either side of that tremendous cause, and to pronounce a judgment which future ages shall declare to be luminous and rightful. The investigation is, in parts, so intricate, so bewildering, and so “ full of perilous hazard,” that it can hardly fail to remind one of those living rocks of classic fable, which were constantly approaching each other with frightful collision—which threatened to crush the intruder that should venture between them—and whose terrors could be ended only by a crew of heroes and of demigods.\* No *such* adventurers have yet attempted the toil and danger of these historical Symplegades, and left the navigation safe and open for future voyagers. Danger and difficulty still frown upon the inquirer, as sternly as ever, from the right hand and from the left: and the enterprise still seems to demand something more than mortal sagacity and daring.

\* ——— δίδμοι γὰρ ἔσαν  
ζωαὶ, κυλινδίσκοντο δὲ κρειπνότεραι  
ἢ βαρυγῶπων ἀνέμων σίχχες· ἀλλ’  
ἤδη τελεύταν κείνος αὐταῖς  
ἡμιθέων πλόος ἀ-  
γαγεν.—Pindar.

Another remarkable circumstance in this controversy is the power which, to this day, it exercises over our feelings. It is impossible to engage deeply in it without a degree of excitement, which would be scarcely credible at the outset, and which appears almost ridiculous when we have for some time laid it aside. We are now at the distance of almost two centuries from the commencement of this great national fever. The crisis has long been over, and has ended most auspiciously for our health and vigour: and the progress of the disease, and the detail of the symptoms, are doubtless abundantly worthy of the profoundest consideration. But we should hardly expect that the study and exposition of *the case* would throw the various lecturers upon it into violent commotion. And yet, never did angry gentlemen of the faculty discuss the fate of the half-defunct patient in the next room, with greater acrimony, than modern polemics will sometimes manifest in their investigations into the causes and the treatment of a political distemper, which is now past and gone, like the violent maladies of our childhood.

It is true that these convulsions have exercised a mighty influence on the present condition of our political constitution, and on that account must always be signally interesting and important. But then the history of them relates to a conflict which our system is not very likely to experience again. A direct encounter between royal prerogative and popular right is no more to be apprehended by us, than a struggle of plebeian wealth and intelligence against feudal oppression. A crusade for the recovery of the holy sepulchre would hardly be less astonishing in these days, than an insurrection of the people of England against the power or influence of the crown. If we have anything to apprehend, it is, not from a strife for mastery between the various estates of the constitution—but from a still more frightful controversy—the controversy between indigence and property—between destitute, portionless, unemployed multitudes on the one hand, and the aristocracy of wealth and privilege on the other. Our danger is from the possible alienation of the public heart from those who sit in the high places of authority, whether in the character of legislators or executive governors;—who crowd into parliament, not as to a field where the national liberties or interests are to be contended for, but as the scene of a scramble for fat emolument, or of a struggle for personal distinction. A want of due sympathy, in short, between the classes who work, or who are idle because their industry is profitless—and the classes who either live in affluent and splendid indolence, or in a selfish pursuit of rank and power—this seems to be the most formidable sign of the times in which we live: and the contemplation of it (one would imagine) must

be rather too absorbing to leave thoughtful minds at leisure for intemperate controversy respecting the merits of Charles's quarrel with his parliaments, or the character and services of Laud and Wentworth. To an unimpassioned bystander it must seem as strange that people should heat themselves, and lose their temper in the agitation of such questions, as that the sorrows of Hecuba should, in a mere dream of passion, bring tears into the eyes, and distraction into the aspect of a poor player! Here are we, often wasting our spirits, and damaging our charity and candour, in the eagerness of our search into the times which gave birth to the distinctions of whig and tory; while whig and tory, and all other political denominations, are watched with a scowl of hatred and contempt by the brood of that many-headed monster, radicalism. We are tilting at each other in a sort of angry tournament, while the ground on which we stand is sown with dragons' teeth, which, peradventure, may soon spring up into furious and armed ruffians.

But whatever we may think of the intense and passionate interest which the contemplation of this period is sure to call forth, one thing is quite obvious,—the topic is one which mediocrity ought never to approach. The subject is too high and sacred to be touched by any but a superior hand. Neither gods nor men—neither Olympus nor Paternoster Row—neither the mansions of immortality nor the club-rooms of the metropolis—will concede a month's existence to a middling history of the "Life and Times" of any of the distinguished men who acted or suffered at or near the period of the great political schism of the seventeenth century. And for this reason we are somewhat concerned to find that the biography of Laud has been undertaken by the present author. It would be neither more nor less than uncivil mockery to compliment him, by ascribing to him the perfections required to form the historian of such a period. Industry, indeed, he seems to possess: and this quality has made him acquainted with a very ample range of authorities. He has, moreover, the faculty of making himself perfectly intelligible so long as he confines himself to the duty of an unambitious narrative; and there appears no reason whatever to question the impartiality of his statements as to mere matters of fact. But then, unhappily, he is often seized with the lust of impressive writing; and when he yields to that temptation, the event, we are compelled to declare, does but too frequently illustrate how short and direct is *the single step* from the sublime to the ridiculous. At other times he ventures into the region of argument and discussion; an exercise which is almost sure to betray his want of intellectual vigour and precision. When his subject requires the cogency of argument and disquisition, he sometimes reminds us of a person who should venture to lay



about him with a flail, without sufficient skill in the use of that somewhat unmanageable instrument; and he is guilty, occasionally, of such awkward aggression on his own cranium, as makes his readers tremble both for him and for his cause. At the same time, it is but justice to allow, that, on the whole, he is by no means altogether destitute of qualifications for his task. He is a devoted admirer of the subject of his labours. He appears to regard no toil as painful, and no time as wasted, *singula dum captus circumvectatur amore*. He is equally ardent in his love and veneration for the Church of which Laud was so uncompromising a champion. He has, moreover, an inexhaustible magazine of wrath at command, ready for discharge against Puritans and Calvinists, and the whole brood of Nonconformity. But here, again, it happens, most unfortunately, that he is rather more free than could be wished in the use of the *flail*; which—to our inexpressible pain and alarm—does sometimes rattle about his ears in a manner that would appal any one, whom an excess of zeal and self-devotion had not rendered insensible to smart and danger. In short—though we agree in many essential particulars with Mr. Lawson—though his views, his principles, and his conclusions are, in general, substantially our own—we cannot but deeply regret that (without the slightest intention to mislead) he has contrived to give to his work so much the character of a *case*, made out by a fiery and over-zealous advocate;—an advocate who seems to have scarcely eyes to see, nor ears to hear, nor tongue to utter, nor understanding to comprehend anything which may be produced to the disadvantage of his client. We are sadly afraid that an intelligible and candid inquirer, solicitous for nothing but the truth, might be apt to shut the book, in utter despair, after perusing the first two hundred pages.

We will, however, detain the reader no longer with our speculations respecting the merits of the biographer; but hasten to an hour's contemplation of the character which has tempted him to his interesting but hazardous enterprise. Respecting Laud it has justly been remarked—that more good and more evil has been said and written of him, than of almost any other historical character that can be named. By some he has been extolled as a miracle of piety and benevolence, of learning, and of wisdom: by others as an exemplification of everything that is inhuman in tyranny, despicable in bigotry and superstition, diabolical in temper, and narrow in understanding. By his admirers he has been held up as the very mirror of loyalty to his king, of fidelity to the constitution as it then existed, and of enlightened zeal for the Church over which he presided. By his adversaries he has been described as the abject worshipper of the royal prerogative, and as a malignant conspirator against the liberties of his country. And

by those who profess to avoid either of these extremities it has been averred that, with the most unbounded devotion to the cause of the Church, he was, in effect, one of her most pernicious enemies; and that his baleful administration occasioned, or at least accelerated, her downfall.

This latter accusation has, if we remember right, been adopted by Warburton, if it did not originate with him. It is very much in his trenchant and sweeping manner; and, like many other of his positions, must be admitted with some caution, and understood with considerable limitation. That the administration of Laud was, on the whole, injurious to the church can hardly be denied. But then it is most important to keep in mind, that the injury was inflicted, not so much by the measures which he adopted, as by the manner in which he enforced them. There never, perhaps, lived a public man, who contrived that his good should be so virulently evil spoken of. His demeanour appears to have been singularly ungracious and unpopular, and his temper offensively irascible and hot. There was nothing affable or engaging in his general behaviour: and his very integrity was often made odious by wearing an aspect of austerity and haughtiness. It would almost seem as if prudence had been struck out from his catalogue of the cardinal virtues. In him, 'discretion never fought against nature.' He never appears to have been aware that the world is governed, or rendered ungovernable, by syllables, and looks, and gestures, and tones of voice; that manner is something with every person, and every thing with some. The consequence of this ignorance, or this disdain, of the ways of the world, was unspeakably pernicious to the cause, for which he, at all times, *counted his life not dear unto him*. In the minds of all who were ignorant of the essential worth of the man, the interests of the establishment were, by his harsh demeanour, associated with every thing that is odious and repulsive. For a considerable portion of his life he was generally regarded as the leader and representative of the ecclesiastical body; and the impression which he communicated to the public was, too often, that of unfeeling arrogance, and lofty impatience of controul. Whether the church could have been saved by any combination, in the person of its ruler, of those rare endowments which secure at once attachment and awe, no human sagacity, perhaps, can at this day be competent to pronounce. But it is by no means surprizing, that this one fatal defect in him should, even in the minds of judicious and impartial men, have connected his administration with the ruin of the establishment.

Two remarkable instances will readily occur to every one, illustrative of the deplorable effects of his want of self command. It

is well known how devotedly Laud was attached to the Duke of Buckingham: and it will not be thought surprizing, that the assassination of his friend and patron should have betrayed him into a transport of grief and rage. But who can forbear lamenting that he should be utterly unable to overmaster these emotions, even at the Council board; and that he should so far forget the statesman and the bishop, as to threaten Felton with the rack, if he refused to discover his accomplices? On reference to the judges, the torture was pronounced unlawful; and the consequence was precisely what might be expected from this unfortunate eruption of vehemence and passion, namely, the immediate circulation of the saying, that crown *law* was more favourable to the subject than crown *divinity*!

Again—when Lord Chief Justice Richardson was summoned before the Council for his officious and scarcely legal interference in the suppression of all Sunday sports and pastimes, the ungracious office of reproof should, unquestionably, have been left to the other members of the board. Unhappily, however, the impetuous temper of Laud disabled him from perceiving how unseemly a spectacle it would be for a Judge to stand and hear his condemnation from the mouth of a Bishop: and he accordingly took upon himself to administer so stern a rebuke, that the Chief Justice ran out, exclaiming, “that he had been almost choked with a pair of lawn sleeves.”

Nothing could be better fitted, than these outbreaks of a rash and hasty humour, to render odious both the prelate himself, and the cause with which, in the public estimation, he was identified. He would, in such unquiet times especially, not only be dreaded as the firm and conscientious disciplinarian, but detested as the rigorous and overbearing priest: and the Church would be sure to suffer grievously for the unpopularity of her governor.

Every one will recollect that Clarendon, who entertained the highest reverence and affection for Laud, was so deeply impressed with the lamentable consequences of this infirmity of his temper, that he once ventured upon a very free expostulation with the Archbishop; and this, too, when he was himself only a young practiser in the law. He has given a full and very interesting account of this conference in his own life; from which it appears, that Laud was far from displeased with the freedom of the young barrister, who seems, in truth to have gone pretty roundly to work with his Grace; for he told him plainly that it was exceedingly to be wished “that he could more reserve his passion towards all persons, how faulty soever; and that he would treat persons of honour and quality, and interest in their country, with more cour-

tesy and condescension, especially when they came to visit him, and make offer of their service." The reply of the Archbishop is abundantly mild and candid, but shows that the defect was then inveterate and incurable. For he said smiling, that

"he could only undertake for his heart; that he had very good meaning; for his tongue, he could not undertake that he would not sometimes speak more hastily and sharply than he should do, (which oftentimes he was sorry, and reprehended himself for,) and in a tone which might be liable to misrepresentation, with them who were not very well acquainted with him, and so knew that it was *an infirmity which his nature and education had so rooted in him, that it was in vain to contend with it*. For the state and distance he kept with men,"—he said—"he thought it was not more than was suitable to the place and degree he held in the Church and State 'or so much as others assumed to themselves, who had sat in his place.' " "And thereupon," adds Clarendon—"he told some behaviour and carriage of his predecessor Abbot (who, he said, was not better born than himself) towards the greatest nobility of the kingdom, which he thought was very insolent and inexcusable, and was, indeed, very ridiculous."\*

From all these instances it appears that, what with an unhappy temper, and what with an imperfect knowledge of mankind, and what with an erroneous notion of manners, he contrived to array more hostility against his eminent virtues, than many of the worst of mankind have often armed against their vices. And, thus he may be said to have furnished some ground for the charge of Warburton, by unhappily exasperating those bad passions, which already were let loose for the destruction of the hierarchy.

But the meanest and most repulsive exhibition which has ever before been given of Laud, is in some respects almost complimentary compared with a recent representation of him by the same artist, who has recently furnished us with a portraiture of Cranmer. If we are

\* It appears that Gauden ventured on a freedom similar to that of Clarendon. A few days after Laud's first confinement, he waited on him; and, on that occasion, represented to him that "it was no hard matter for a good and great man honestly to make himself gracious with the best and most people . . . . that, in some cases and postures of times, a wise man was not bound to do people more good than they could or would bear; nor was he to surfeit and tire them by overdriving them to better pasture."—This was shrewd and admirable counsel: but, at first it was listened to by Laud "with something of a severe brow." At length, however, he gravely and calmly replied; protesting with a serious attestation of his integrity, before God's omniscience,—that, "however he might mistake in the mean and method, yet he never had other design than the glory of God, the service of his Majesty, and the good order, peace, and decency, of the Church of England."

Gauden (whose opinion may safely be taken where he had no interest to bias him)—concludes his character of the Archbishop by saying, "Doubtless this prelate had more in him of charity, liberality, munificence, and magnificence, than ever I saw in any of those, who are the *having* and *getting*, not the *giving*, enemies of episcopacy." See Nic. Armin. and Calvin. p. 639 note.

to credit this likeness of him, Laud was, without exception, the most contemptible character in English history; and the parliament were to blame for their treatment of him, not because it was meanly vindictive and detestably iniquitous, but because so much good and serviceable persecution was absolutely thrown away upon so despicable an object. It is graciously allowed that he was no traitor within the statute: but this was, because his capacities were too limited to advance him to the dignity of treason. His talents for evil were so miserably poor, that it was beneath the majesty of a great nation to inflict upon him any thing but contemptuous mercy.\* It is true that he was "*without benevolence or piety*,"—"without any sense of duty to God or man:" but, nevertheless, the impeachment or the attainder—the gibbet or the axe—were positively degraded by their employment on so insignificant and worthless a delinquent.

Such is the last new version of the character of Laud: and, in proof of his silliness and weakness, his "*incomparable diary*" is fixed upon as a performance which might make us "*forget the vices of his heart in the abject imbecility of his intellect*." Now, to us, this effort to vilify the understanding of a distinguished scholar and divine, appears to be neither more nor less than an impudent experiment, made for the purpose of ascertaining how much petulance and absurdity might be administered to the public, in a single dose, without producing a violent emetrical reaction. To estimate the powers of Laud by his occasional notice of dreams and omens, is just about as reasonable and candid as it would be to measure the capacities of Samuel Johnson by the scraps and fragments which record his fits of melancholy or superstition,—by his reminiscences of Tetty,—and by his prayers for the peace of her departed spirit. Again, to judge of Laud's sagacity or wisdom by the entries of matters of fact in his diary, is as ridiculous as it would be to look in the list of bankruptcies and promotions—in the court circular—or in the daily collection of accidents and occurrences—for a test of the ability of the conductor of a public Journal. The Diary of the Archbishop consists chiefly of dry memoranda of passing events, made obviously for his own private convenience. He no more compiled it with a view to publication, than a man joins in the most ordinary topics of daily discourse with a view to publication. Occasionally, it is true, he notices a dream, or an accident, to which imagination might give an ominous complexion. But he does this without appearing to attach the slightest permanent impor-

\* This seems to be, likewise, the opinion of Mr. Godwin, who thinks that Laud should have been dismissed to obscurity and contempt.—Vol. i. p. 249.

tance to such shadowy suggestions. The mightiest understanding will sometimes be crossed, for a moment, by gloomy associations, or dim forebodings, especially when harassed and excited by affairs of overpowering interest. And these transient perturbations may be mentioned to a friend in the confidence of private intercourse, and then at once dismissed from the mind. Laud, however, seems to have been without the advantage of an intimate companion, with whom he could share his thoughts, (a circumstance which is much and justly lamented by Clarendon,) and, accordingly, he made a confidant of his Diary! Besides,—some allowance may justly be made for opinions and prejudices still current in an age, not yet wholly purged of those superstitions which haunt the twilight of imperfect knowledge and civilization. It is notorious that witchcraft and sorcery were firmly believed by many of the Puritans and Covenanters; and that their hatred was seldom at a loss to discover signs and prognostics of the Archbishop's fall. It is, therefore, either superlatively foolish, or intolerably malicious, to seize upon some half a dozen passages of a somewhat visionary cast, among his private memoranda, (extending as they do over a space of more than fifty years), and to produce these as evidence of a mind enslaved and enfeebled by superstitious fancies.

But though we cannot appeal to the Diary of Laud in support of his literary and theological reputation, we may assuredly consult it for a much higher purpose. It has been said that his letters to Strafford indicate no sense of duty to God or man; that his concern for the honour of the University—his anxiety to improve the condition of the clergy—his efforts to restore the decency and solemnity of public worship—and his solicitude to preserve the sacred edifices from ruin and profanation—all are to be ascribed to a feeling purely professional—to that *esprit de corps* which is often to be found in the most abandoned of human beings, and which implies no principle either of *benevolence* or *piety*. All this has been said; and let all this, *for the moment*, be admitted. We turn, then, to his private memoranda. We say nothing, at present, of the History which he drew up of his Troubles and Trial; nothing of his admirable private devotions;—but we appeal to the loose and unpremeditated fragments of his Diary for a triumphant demolition of the calumny which has called his piety and his beneficence in question. Is it possible for any man (except a confirmed believer in the turpitude and duplicity of his species) to witness the secret outpourings of the prelate's heart, and yet to charge him with a want of charity or religion? To what shall we ascribe his repeated expressions of trust in the merciful protection of Providence, and his frequent invocations of forgive-



ness on his enemies, persecutors and slanderers—(breathed and recorded as they were in the solitude of his chamber)—to what shall we ascribe these indications of a soul filled with love towards God and man? Must we, *charitably*, attribute them to a habit of professional hypocrisy, so inveterate as to pursue the individual even to his secret retirements?—a habit almost as insane as that of the miser, who robbed his own till when he was without any other opportunity of fraudulent appropriation! At the end of the Diary is printed a list of noble and munificent projects which the bishop had formed, and some of which he lived to accomplish: and are we gravely required to believe that these costly and benevolent designs were suggested by no feeling higher than that of a bigoted devotion to the credit of his order?—Are we to presume that the person who could make the following entry in his journal, was under no sense of duty to his Creator and his brethren?

“The way to do the town of Reading good, for their poor; which may be compassed by God’s blessing upon me, though my wealth be small. And I hope God will bless me in it, because it was his own motion in me. For this way never came into my thoughts (though I had much beaten them about it) till this night, as I was at my prayers.”—*Diary*, p. 50, January 1, 1633-4.

Is this, we ask, the language of one whose character was destitute of the elements which constitute an amiable and worthy individual, and who throughout his life was a stranger to any better motive than “the indulgence of a *malignant humour*?”

Once more—on the day that he was committed to the Tower we find the following memorandum:—

“I stayed at Lambeth till the evening to avoid the gazing of the people. I went to evening prayer in my chapel. The psalms of the day, psalms 93 and 94, and chap. 50 of Isaiah, gave me great comfort. God make me worthy of it, and fit to receive it.”

“As I went to my barge, hundreds of my poor neighbours stood there, and prayed for my safety and return to my house.”—*Diary*, p. 60, December 18, 1640.

We should be glad to know how the vindictive malice of Prynne himself would account for such an entry as this, if the benevolence and piety of the writer be denied. If this secret and simple record is not allowed to prove the habitual practice of liberality and kindness, and a deep sense of religious consolation, neither could it be established by the testimony of one risen from the dead.

We have expressed above some little surprize at the vehemence with which the controversy respecting these remote events and characters is occasionally carried on; and yet, we must confess

that, at this moment, we are, ourselves, not wholly unconscious of a somewhat polemical commotion of spirit. For, after all, it is a most offensive spectacle to behold the memory of the illustrious dead lacerated and soiled by the hand of arrogant, unfeeling scorn. It is scarcely possible to witness such profanation with composure. Whatever may have been the defects of Laud, it cannot be denied that his munificence was princely—his learning eminent—his love of letters generous and noble—his integrity and disinterestedness unimpeachable—his religion deep and sincere—and his zeal conscientious, though sometimes excessive, and sometimes mistaken. And such being our conviction, we cannot witness without loathing, the savage delight with which his failings have recently been gibbeted, and his name associated with all that is base and despicable in human nature.

In justice to this distinguished prelate, we cannot, perhaps, do better than seize the present opportunity of rapidly surveying some of the leading occurrences of his life. We shall thus be enabled to place before our readers the origin of the bitterest calumnies which assailed him while living, and enable them to form a fair estimate of that course of action which brought him to his death.

He was born in the year 1573, at Reading, and (as his biographer is at some superfluous pains to satisfy us) of reputable parents. The stupid malignity of the Puritans, indeed, wearied itself with endeavours to depress the man, by speaking of his birth as absolutely mean and sordid—apparently unconscious that by lowering his origin, they were but exalting the merit of his elevation. His childhood was miserably weak and sickly, but he recovered sufficient health to attend the Free School at Reading. Here he remained till he was sixteen years of age, and in 1589 was sent to St. John's College, Oxford, where, according to Wood, he was noted for "a very forward, confident and zealous person." His very first theological exploit at the University marked him as an object of unextinguishable hatred to the Puritans, and to Abbot their patron and champion. In answer to a treatise by that divine, Laud had affirmed that the Church of Rome, though hideously corrupt, never ceased to be a Church, and that, from her, the life-blood was transmitted to our Apostolic and Episcopal Establishment. In short, he virtually maintained, (to anticipate an illustration of his own,\*) that she was a true Church, much in the same sense that a thief is a *true man*; and that though she had greatly depraved her nature, she had never wholly forfeited or lost it. This view of the matter, though by no means remarkably gracious or complimentary, was nevertheless

\* In his conference with Fisher.

an abomination to the Calvinists; and from that moment to the end of his days, Laud was detested and pursued by them, as a confederate of Popery, and a sworn enemy to the Gospel of Christ.

The year 1605 was distinguished by an event almost fatal to his peace of mind, and highly injurious to his promotion. He was then Chaplain to the Earl of Devonshire, by whose urgent entreaties he was prevailed on to solemnize a marriage between that Earl and Lady Penelope Devereux. This lady, it appears, had been divorced from her husband, Lord Rich, in consequence of an adulterous connection with the Earl of Devonshire, who was desirous both of repairing by marriage the injury inflicted on her honour, and of giving legitimacy to the children which had sprung from their guilty intercourse. It further appears, that a verbal contract of marriage had passed between the parties previous to her union with Lord Rich, which had been forced upon her by the tyranny of her parents. The legal principles applicable to such a case were at that time extremely unsettled: and Laud, partly overcome by the solicitations of his patron, and partly moved by the interesting circumstances of the story, was tempted to choose the most indulgent doctrine, and to unite in matrimony two persons who had originally been engaged to each other, and whose affections had suffered such cruel disappointment. This unfortunate compliance exposed him for a long time to the displeasure of the king, to the upbraidings of his enemies, and to the reproaches of his own conscience. He ever after observed St. Stephen's day as an annual fast, in penitential remembrance of that great error; and composed a prayer for pardon of his offence, which we insert in the margin.\* It may gratify the persecutors of his memory, to find him distinctly confessing that he did, on one

\* "Behold thy servant, O my God, and in the bowels of thy mercy have compassion upon me. Behold, I am become a reproach to thy holy name, by serving my ambition and the sins of others, which, though I did by the persuasion of other men, yet my own conscience did check and upbraid me in it. Lord, I beseech thee, for the mercies of Jesus Christ, enter not into judgment with me thy servant, but hear his blood imploring mercies for me. Neither let this marriage prove a divorcing of my soul from thy grace and favour; for much more happy had I been, if, being mindful this day, I had suffered martyrdom, as did St. Stephen, the first of martyrs, denying that, whether either my less faithful friends, or less godly friends, had pressed upon me. I promised to myself that the darkness would hide me; but that hope soon vanished away: nor doth the light appear more plainly, than that I have committed that foul offence. Even so, O Lord, it pleased thee, of thy infinite mercy, to deject me with this heavy ignominy, that I might learn to seek thy name. O Lord, how grievous is the remembrance of my sin to this very day, after so many and such reiterated prayers poured out unto thee from a sorrowful and afflicted spirit. Be merciful unto me; hearken to the prayers of thy humble and dejected servant, and raise me up again, O Lord, that I may not die in this my sin, but that I may live in thee hereafter; and living, evermore rejoice in thee, through the merits and the mercies of Jesus Christ my Lord and Saviour. Amen."—vol. i. p. 116.

occasion, act in opposition to his conscience, though, perhaps, the secret expression of such deep and bitter repentance may somewhat perplex those who have persuaded themselves, that he passed his life in utter insensibility of all religious or moral obligations. For ourselves, though we are not surprized at the tenderness of his own wounded conscience, we cannot but think that if ever there was a case which called for an indulgent interpretation of ambiguous law, the case in question was, in nearly all its circumstances, of that description. At all events the offence was greatly exaggerated by the malice of his enemies; some of whom—and Abbot among the number—did not scruple to omit, in their representations of it, the most important fact in palliation of the delinquency—namely, that Lady Rich had been divorced from her husband.

In 1606 he narrowly escaped the outpouring of all the phials of Calvinistic wrath. He preached a sermon before the University, which was offensive to the Presbyterians. The Vice-Chancellor fulminated, but Laud was thunder-proof; and the storm, after growling for some time over his head, rolled away, and left him unscathed. His old adversary Abbot, however, seized the occasion, and openly pointed at him as one deeply tainted with the Romish leprosy; till at last it was thought dangerous to approach the heretic, or to salute him in the streets! Nay, the report of his defection from the truth was spread from Oxford to Cambridge; and Hall, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, thought it needful to write him a letter of expostulation, in which he exhorts him after the following fashion:—

“Resolve one way, and know at last what you do hold, or what you should. Cast off your wings or your teeth, and, loathing this bat-like nature, be either a bird or a beast. To die wavering and uncertain, yourself will grant fearful. If you must settle, when begin you? If you must begin, why not now? God crieth with Jehu, Who is on my side, who? Look out at your window to him, and in a resolute courage cast down the Jezebel that hath bewitched you.”

Such, in those days, was the language of Hall to Laud!—of Hall, who lived to take up arms, in defence of the Church, under the auspices of the very man, whom he now took upon himself to tutor and to discipline!

It is needless to dwell on the history of Laud's smaller preferments. We pass to the year 1611, when, in spite of the most virulent opposition from the Puritans, he was elected President of St. John's College; soon after which, to the confusion of his enemies, he was appointed one of the Royal Chaplains. From this time he may be regarded as a public man. It was not, however, till the year 1616 that he obtained the Deanery of Gloucester.

ter, a preferment of little value, but sufficient to assure him of the confidence of the king, which Abbot had constantly laboured to intercept. A little before this time it was that he was publicly insulted from the pulpit, at Oxford, by Abbot, the Regius Professor of Divinity (the brother of the primate), and, according to his own account, was "fain to sit patiently and hear himself abused almost an hour together, being pointed at as he sat." The circumstance is worth adverting to, chiefly because it illustrates the spirit which never ceased to persecute him till it brought him to the scaffold, and because it shows what were the opinions then stigmatized, as treasonable to the Protestant religion. The following is a specimen of the language of his assailant:—

"Some," said the preacher, "are partly Romish, partly English, as occasion serves them, that a man might say unto them, *noster es, an adversariorum?*—who, under pretence of preaching against the Puritans, strike at the heart and root of the religion now established among us . . . If they do at any time speak against the Papists, they do but beat a little about the bush, and that but softly too, for fear of waking and disquieting the birds that are in it. They speak nothing but that wherein one Papist will speak against another, as against equivocation, the Pope's temporal power, and the like, and, perhaps, some of their blasphemous speeches. But in the points of *free-will*, justification, concupiscence being a sin after baptism, *inherent righteousness*, and *certainity of salvation*, the Papists beyond the seas can say they are wholly theirs; and the recusants at home make their boast of them." . . . . "Might not Christ say, what art thou? Romish or English? Papist or Protestant? Or, what art thou? a mongrel compound of both; a Protestant by ordination, a Papist in point of *free-will*, *inherent righteousness*, and the like? A Protestant in receiving the Sacrament, a Papist in the doctrine of the Sacrament? What! do you think there are two heavens? If there be, get you to the other, and place yourselves there; for unto this where I am, ye shall never come."\*

This passage is extremely important and memorable. It discloses to us the ingredients which entered into the composition of what Mr. Hallam has been pleased to term the *semi-Protestant divinity* of those days. And we would earnestly intreat our readers to keep this disclosure steadily in mind, when they would estimate the justice of the charge, that the theologians of James and Charles were guilty of a deliberate approximation to the Romish doctrine. To exalt the eucharist above a mere act of commemoration—to maintain the freedom of the human will—to doubt that the elect are favoured with a perfect assurance of Salvation,—all these were infallible symptoms of a relapse into superstition and corruption. Every step from Calvinism was held to

\* Vol. i. p. 157. Heylin, pp. 61, 62. Rushw. vol. i. p. 62.

be towards Popery. All who were not fixed and stationary at Geneva, were denounced as meditating a desertion to Rome. By artifices like these it was that the character of Papist was made to adhere so strongly to Laud, that he could no more shake it off than he could escape from his own shadow. Let him say or do what he would, he was still no better than a servant of Antichrist!

On his promotion to the Deanery of Gloucester, he found there, in ample measure, the glories and blessings of the Calvinistic discipline. The Church was, altogether, in a state of scandalous disorder. It was as a vineyard which had been rooted up by the snout, and trampled under the hoof, of a wild and sordid fanaticism. The Cathedral was fallen to decay, and its worship was assimilated as nearly as might be to the service of the conventicle. The new dean, without loss of time, applied himself to the redress of these abuses; and in spite of the opposition of the clergy, animated and supported as they were by their Calvinistic bishop, he at last succeeded. The solemnities of divine worship, at Gloucester, were, by his firmness, effectually and permanently reformed. But then, the reformer, went forth more indelibly branded than ever with the mark of an incorrigible and malignant Papist!

The next symptom of his treachery to the Protestant faith was the introduction of an organ into the Chapel of St. John's College: for what was this, but to aid the incantations of the purple Sorceress? It was now beyond dispute, that he had sold himself to work *with greediness* all manner of antichristian iniquity, and superstitious abomination! And yet—to crown the infamy and the scandal—"in the full blossom of his sins," and with this damning proof of apostasy upon him, he received additional marks of the confidence of his sovereign. He was promoted in 1620 to a prebendal stall at Westminster; and on the following year was advanced to the Bishopric of St. David's. For this latter promotion he is said to have been indebted to the urgent recommendation of Buckingham and Bishop Williams: but it has been shrewdly suspected, that the good offices of the latter were considerably quickened by his own desire to retain for himself the Deanery of Westminster, a preferment which was then expected to devolve to Laud, and which he would probably have greatly preferred to the bishopric. It has further been alleged, that the king was violently averse to his promotion to the mitre; and that he declared, in his very broadest and most royal Doric, that the advocates and patrons of Laud would soon repent of their bargain.\* We are in no condition to contradict this amusing story;

\* "Tak him to ye—but ba ma saul ye'll repant it!"



but yet we know not well how to reconcile it with a fact, which would seem to show that he was still in secure possession of the royal favour; namely, that he was honoured by his Majesty with permission to hold the Presidentship of St. John's in commendam with his bishopric. Of this license, however, he forbore to take advantage. "By reason," he says, in his Diary, "of the strictness of that statute, which I will not violate, nor my oath to it, on any colour, I am resolved, before my consecration, to leave it."\* And he did leave it accordingly; a circumstance which we recommend to the attention of the enemies to his memory, as an additional evidence of his want of all "sense of duty towards God or man!"

The year 1622 was memorable for Laud's immortal conference with Fisher. The occasion of this theological encounter must appear whimsical and curious enough, when viewed by the light of modern notions and habits. The affair is literally as follows: The lady of the prime minister falls into the hands of a prowling Jesuit, who spares no pains to entice her back to the fold of the Universal Shepherd of Christendom. These practices soon came to the knowledge of his sacred Majesty; who, by virtue of his office as Supreme Guardian and Head Doctor of the Church, thinks it necessary to take the fair catechumen under his own especial tuition. Unfortunately, his paternal labours herein are far from answerable to his zeal. The illustrious dame remains still perplexed in conscience, and is in imminent danger of a relapse into superstition and idolatry. The royal theologian finds it necessary to call in the services of two other distinguished divines. The persons appointed to this office are Laud, and Dr. White (afterwards Bishop of Ely), who are pitted, in a regular match, against the Romish champion. Three obstinate conflicts, accordingly, took place, of which the last and most important was conducted wholly by Laud; and on each of these occasions the parties present, were the lady herself, (the prize for which the polemics were contending,) her husband the Duke of Buckingham, her mother, and the Lord Keeper Williams.

Of this Conference a full account is still extant, drawn up by Laud himself.† It is impossible for us to peruse it without

\* Diary, p. 4.

† "A Relation of the Conference between William Lawd, then Lord Bishop of St. David's, now Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and Mr. Fisher, the Jesuit, by command of King James of ever blessed memorie: with an Answer to such Exceptions as A. C. takes against it. By the said Reverend Father in God, William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. London, 1639." The exceptions of A. C., alluded to in this title-page, were contained in a Relation of the Conference printed in the year 1626, by another Jesuit, or the same, under the name of A. C., as we learn from Laud's Preface.

astonishment at the fact, that duke or duchess should be found throughout the land with patience to sit the dispute out to its conclusion. We grievously suspect that, in these degenerate days, peer and peeress and commoner would be about as deeply edified by such a theological monomachy, as my Uncle Toby and Trim were by the ingenious variety of evolutions exhibited by those great polemic divines, Gymnast and Captain Tripet. Like the honest Corporal, they would, probably, vote it to be little better than a Tom-fool sort of a battle, after all! Our astonishment, however, is still greater, that a person of liberal attainments, ample information, and literary habits, should now be found to pronounce the antagonist of Fisher despicable "for the *abject feebleness of his understanding*." We should conceive that no person, with the slightest capacity of judging, could examine this treatise, without profound admiration for the powers and resources of its author. There is not a weapon in the magazines and armouries of primitive antiquity, or the scholastic ages, with which he does not appear to be perfectly familiar. There is no refuge of lies to which his sagacity does not enable him to trace his enemy, and from which his vigour and perseverance does not effectually unearth him. Well might he be entitled to say to his auditors,

καὶ μαρτυρεῖτε συνῆρόμῳς ἵχνος κακῶν  
ῥινηλατοῦντι τῶν πάλαι πεπραγμένων.\*

When Sophocles was presented by his sons to the judges as a dotard, unfit to be trusted with the management of his own property, he extinguished this unnatural persecution, in a moment, by simply producing his *Œdipus Coloneus*. If Laud were now to revisit the earth for the purpose of repelling, before a tribunal of competent intelligence and impartiality, the imputation of being a contemptible driveller, he would only have to request that they would carefully peruse his *Conference with Fisher*.

It is now, we believe, generally allowed by all Protestants who have minutely examined the Popish Controversy, that in this collision the Jesuit was demolished. And nothing, indeed, can well be more hopeless, at this day, than the attempt to fix upon Laud the charge of a secret attachment to those corruptions and absurdities which he has here so victoriously exposed. Even Mr. Hallam, who is among the bitterest enemies of his name, is compelled to allow that he then made a resolute and effective stand for the truth. It is impossible therefore to reflect, without indignation, on the fact, that, in his own time, it profited him nothing that he stepped forward to do battle against the adversaries of all

\* *Æschyli Agam.*

religious freedom; that he still remained, in the estimation of his persecutors, "a most toad-spotted traitor;" and that, while his achievement procured for him the deep and venomous hatred of the Papists, it was unable to win for him a particle of courtesy and good-will from the most fanatical adversaries of Rome. Had he preached a Crusade against the Seven Hills, the Calvinists would have regarded it as a stratagem to betray them into the hands of the ancient Harlot and Enchantress! How could they trust a man who had the infamy to question whether the Pope was Antichrist, and Rome the Babylonian strumpet? How could they endure to look upon the triumph of one who had openly declared, that Popery and Puritanism were as the upper and the nether mill-stones, and that between the two the Church of England was in danger of being crushed to atoms!

We might here, properly enough, introduce some examination into the merits of the quarrel between Laud and Bishop Williams; but we decline the task, as both perplexing and repulsive. The affair, it must be allowed, was very far from creditable to either party; and it would, probably, be no easy matter to make an equitable division of the blame between them. If we may judge from his Diary, it seems to have weighed heavily on the spirits of Laud; and, whoever was the aggressor, it cannot be denied that the vengeance of Williams was watchful and implacable, and that it pursued its victim almost to the grave. Of that very remarkable person we shall only observe, that he appears to have been one of the most anomalous characters in history. He was undoubtedly a man of extraordinary powers and vast attainments. He seems, likewise, to have been of a capacious and munificent heart, utterly unable to confine itself to a low and narrow sphere of action. But, connected with those great qualities, there was a worldly spirit of intrigue; a sleepless and insatiable ambition; a lust of advancement and of power, which is always of most pernicious example in the person of a Churchman. To these (if Clarendon may be credited) we must add a genius for lying, so active and inexhaustible, that his inventive faculty must have been in a state of perpetual orgasm. He seems to have had his *tongue bent like a bow*,\* in constant readiness for the discharge of fiction. To him a mere prosaic adherence to matter of fact must have been insufferably wearisome. The exercise of his singular powers he must have felt to be almost necessary to a pleasurable state of existence. Now this peculiarity might, of itself, be well nigh sufficient to guide us to a tolerably safe opinion relative to this unhappy dissension. Whatever were the failings of Laud, duplicity, most certainly, was not of the number. Even his persecutors were

\* Jer. ix. 3.

compelled to bear witness to his uncompromising plainness and consistency. Williams, on the contrary, was habitually, and almost constitutionally, a liar; and who ever knew a liar whose integrity could be trusted, even in matters of life and death? Who would look for a scrupulous adversary in one to whom the practice of veracity was absolutely irksome? And how desperately formidable must have been the enmity of a person who was under the dominion of an aspiring temper, but free from the restraints of strict and lofty principle?

About this time it was that the funds of the Charter-house were rescued from confiscation by the uncourtly firmness and integrity of Laud. In vain was it urged by Buckingham, that such an appropriation would both ease the subject, and relieve the necessities of the king. The bishop inflexibly withstood his friend and patron to the face; and at the hazard of the favourite's resentment, and of the monarch's displeasure, preserved this noble foundation to the cause of charity and literature—an additional instance of his want of all moral and religious principle!

The coronation of Charles I. in 1625, provided the enemies of Laud with additional weapons against him, though they were so contemptibly feeble and pointless, that nothing but desperate malignity would have condescended to take them up. In officiating as Dean of Westminster for Bishop Williams (then in disgrace), he is said to have found among the *regalia* an ancient crucifix of silver, and to have ordered it to be placed upon the altar; and this precious ingredient was immediately thrown in, to give fresh effervescence to the charge of Popery, then beginning to grow stale and vapid. The clamour which it raised can hardly fail to remind our readers of the yell which was set up by the Dissenters, in the following century, against Bishop Butler, for fixing, or repairing, a cross in his Cathedral at Bristol. Of this silly and despicable accusation little more need be said, than that it almost refutes itself. It will be remembered that Abbot presided over the ceremonial of the coronation, and that it is hardly credible that he, of all men, would have endured for a moment the exhibition of the idolatrous symbol; and this was the answer actually given by Laud himself, (when the charge was produced against him at his impeachment,) accompanied, however, with a positive declaration, that he had not the slightest recollection of the circumstance in question!\*

A much graver imputation was, that he had the shameless audacity to introduce an alteration into the body of the Coronation oath; and such an alteration, too, as tended materially to weaken the security of the subject. Such was the tragic emphasis with

\* Troubles, &c. p. 518.

which this article was afterwards insisted upon, that it set the whole kingdom in a flame. And yet (will it be believed?) this enormous charge was, from beginning to end, utterly destitute of all foundation. A single sentence from the archbishop's full and irresistible reply to it,\* will be sufficient to scatter the whole of this calumny to the winds. "With much labour," he says, "I got the books to be compared in the Lords' house; that of King James's coronation, and that of King Charles's; and they were found to agree in all things to a syllable." It was said at the time, and perhaps truly said, that if the charge could have been substantiated, this single delinquency might have been enough righteously to forfeit the archbishop's life. It turned out to be "false as Hell;" and was alone sufficient to cover the parliament with infamy.

The next promotion of Laud was to the See of Bath and Wells, in 1626; and in the same year it was, that he was appointed by the King to draw up instructions, for circulation among the Bishops and Clergy, exhorting them to a cheerful submission to taxes, imposed without the authority of Parliament, but necessary for the general peace of Christendom, and the welfare of the Protestant religion. Perhaps we may safely fix upon this as the very first questionable proceeding, of a political nature, in the Bishop's life. It is to little purpose to allege, as Mr. Lawson has done, that Laud was not to blame, because he acted, purely, in a ministerial capacity, as a faithful servant to the King. The measure was one which, if successful, must be a death-blow to a free Constitution: and it is absurd to say, that the agents of a monarch who makes any such attempt may justly escape responsibility. The true vindication of Laud, and others who thought and acted like him, is to be derived from the extreme indistinctness of the line which, in those days, was drawn by the law, between the prerogatives of the king and the rights of the people. We feel profoundly convinced that, when Laud issued these instructions, he was, throughout, wholly unconscious of any breach of the constitution, and entirely guiltless of any design against the liberties of his countrymen, and the *fundamental laws* of the land. There were many in those days who honestly held it for a *fundamental law* that, in cases of extreme exigency, it was the duty of the subject to aid the King, without waiting for the sanction of Parliament; and that the right of calling for such aid was an inherent and unalienable prerogative of the crown. And it will hardly be questioned, that if ever there was an emergency, which would warrant the exercise of that prerogative, such an emergency had arrived, when the Parliament drove the King into a war, and then left him destitute

\* Troubles and Trial, pp. 318—324.

of supplies. We have, of late, indeed, heard it vehemently asserted, that “*a fixed hatred of liberty was the principle of the whole public conduct of Charles;*” an imputation, which, if well founded, would, justly consign many of his servants to infamy, as agents and ministers of despotism. It would be much nearer the truth to say, that his ruling principle was a fear of parliamentary encroachment; a resolution to transmit the royal authority in its full integrity to his children; a desire, in short,—not to alter the constitution—but to maintain the constitution as he had been taught, from childhood, to understand it. Whether these views implied any defect of intelligence or sagacity is a distinct question: but assuredly, it would be most unreasonable to regard them as indications of a want of patriotism. At the same time, it may be truly affirmed, that if ever a “*hatred of liberty*” did, for a moment, find its way into his heart, the conduct of his Parliament had been admirably fitted to introduce it there. They had exposed him to degradation and contempt in the eyes of all Europe: and if such were to be the effects of freedom, is it altogether surprising that they should engender some distaste for popular institutions, in the mind even of the most patriotic prince on earth? Can it be subject of wonder, that a monarch, environed on all sides with difficulty and dishonour, by the treacherous parsimony of the Commons, should begin to think it absolutely impossible to carry on the government, without an occasional resort to arbitrary and transcendent power? Was it wholly unnatural, that the royal prerogative should appear, to a prince so circumstanced, as a necessary moving force, in the absence of which the political mechanism would be liable to perpetual and ruinous stoppage, from the caprice or the obstinacy of a faction? We have reason to be most profoundly grateful that Charles was disabled from following out these formidable surmises into all their practical consequences. But we, likewise, contend, that nothing could be better calculated than the proceedings of the Parliament to drive him into such a train of speculation.

With regard to the views of Laud upon this important subject, it is but equitable that he should be allowed to speak for himself. His language, unquestionably, is not exactly that of the constitution, as it was finally modelled in 1688; but it is such language as was spoken at that day by multitudes, who had no “*hatred of liberty,*” and no attachment to despotic government.

“I did never,” says he, “advise his majesty that he might, at his own pleasure, levy money on his subjects, without their consent in Parliament. Nor do I remember that ever I affirmed any such thing as is



charged in the article. But, I do believe, I may have said something to the effect following: that, howsoever it stands with the law of God, for a King, in the just and necessary defence of himself and his kingdom to levy money of his subjects, yet, when a particular national law doth intervene in any kingdom, and is settled by mutual consent of the King and his people, these monies ought to be levied by and according to that law. And by God's law, and the same law of the land, I humbly conceive, the subjects so met in Parliament ought to supply their Prince, when there is just and necessary cause. And if an absolute necessity do happen *by invasion, or otherwise, which gives no time for councils or law*, such a necessity—but *no pretended one*—is above all law. And I have heard the greatest lawyers in the kingdom confess, that, *in times of such necessity*, the King's prerogative is as great as this."\*

And then follow certain considerations which are always com-  
modiously forgotten by those, who delight in representing the  
friends and servants of the King as a band of conspirators against  
the rights and liberties of Englishmen.

"And since there is, of late, such a noise made about the sub-  
version of the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and men's lives this way  
called in question; 'tis very requisite that these fundamental laws were  
known to all men, that they may see the danger before they run upon  
it. Whereas now, the Common Laws of England have no text at all.  
In so much, that many, who would think themselves wronged if they  
were not accounted good lawyers, cannot assure a man in many points  
what the law is. . . . And, under favour, I think it were a work worthy  
of Parliament to command some prime lawyers to draw up a body of  
the Common Law, and then have it carefully examined by all the judges  
of the realm, and thoroughly weighed by both houses, and then have  
this book declared and confirmed by Act of Parliament, as containing  
the fundamental laws of the kingdom."†

It is well known that these comparatively moderate views were  
left far behind by the impetuous zeal of other Churchmen, and  
especially of Drs. Sibthorpe and Manwaring, the latter of whom  
did not scruple to declare, in a Sermon before the Court,

"that the King is not bound to observe the laws of the realm concern-  
ing the subject's rights and liberties, but that his royal will and com-  
mand in imposing loans and taxes, though without the consent of Par-  
liament, ought to be obeyed, *at the hazard of eternal damnation!*"

This, to be sure, was, as Collier honestly terms it,

"a most extravagant divinity, subversive of the Constitution, and preach-  
ing against the Statute Book: and if pursued through all its conse-  
quences would make Magna Charta, and the other laws for securing  
property, signify little."

Nevertheless, it seems hardly too much for the voracious loyalty  
of Mr. Lawson: for, having first fortified himself by sundry

\* History of Troubles, &c. cap. vii. p. 150.

† Ibid.

admissions of the unconstitutional and unscriptural complexion of such principles, (just as a fire-eater prepares himself for thaumaturgy, by washing his tongue and throat with prophylactic liniment)—he tells us, at last, that

“if *not even one* of Sibthorpe’s and Manwaring’s positions were *true*, they would yet be *justifiable*, inasmuch as it was *policy* to restrain the wild republicanism of the age, which was threatening so much danger to the state!”\*

This assertion forcibly illustrates the extreme peril of sharp instruments, in the hands of persons whose discretion has not reached its maturity! There are not many things in the book *quite* so monstrous as this: with sorrow, however, we confess that extravagancies are, occasionally, to be found in it, which bear a considerable family likeness to the above; and we need scarcely add, that even a single prodigy of this description would be enough to deter us from following any author, with much confidence, through the labyrinth of those critical and awful times.

The Parliament, which met soon after, instantly commenced the exercise of their inquisitorial power. They summoned Manwaring,—extorted from him an humble submission,—sentenced him to be imprisoned during pleasure,—imposed on him a fine of £1000,—interdicted him from *ever* preaching again at Court,—and, for three years, from preaching anywhere,—and, lastly, pronounced him disabled from holding any ecclesiastical dignity! A more impudent and atrocious violation of the constitution cannot be imagined than this portentous stretch of Parliamentary privilege. We have been told—and told very justly—that, (on a subsequent occasion,) if the king wished to prosecute the five members for treason, “a Bill against them should have been sent to the Grand Jury.” We say, in the same manner, that if the Commons considered Manwaring’s Sermon as a dangerous political libel, the Attorney General should have been directed to deal with it accordingly. If they imagined it to be a scandal upon religion, they might have voted a resolution to that effect, and have stigmatized it as calling for the censure of the ecclesiastical judge. But the sentence which they actually pronounced, was as directly subversive of the constitution, as the most outrageously arbitrary measure of the crown. It tended to transfer to a legislative body all civil and ecclesiastical authority, and ultimately all the functions of the executive government. It was calculated to arm against the cause of freedom all the prejudices and resentments of the king, and all the fears of his best counsellors and most faithful subjects.

\* Vol. i. p. 364.

In this part of his history, as in many others, Mr. L. indulges in much sonorous declamation, respecting the manifold demerits and abominations of Calvinism. That Calvinism was then rampant, and ready to fix upon the Church with fang and claw, is beyond all reasonable question. But, then, we love not to look upon weapons which—like many of those beneath the elbow of this assailant—must always recoil from the hide of that thick-skinned monster. We therefore hasten to the year 1628, when Laud was appointed to the see of London; a post which brought him into more immediate conflict with the faction then in conspiracy against the Establishment. Almost his first care, upon his elevation, was to obtain statutes for regulating the election of proctors at Oxford, and to prevent the disgraceful turbulence which had usually occurred on those occasions; and to collect and arrange the ancient statutes of the University, with a view to procuring a still more ample and honourable charter than that which it then enjoyed. One would hardly conceive it possible for malice and subtilty combined, to extort from these useful and exemplary labours any materials for accusation. But nothing is too hard for the perseverance and ingenuity of a vindictive and shameless faction. They contrived, on this occasion, to call up even the good deeds of the bishop, and to marshal them in judgment against him. His *wise* and generous exertions for the University were actually pressed into the service of his impeachment; and were produced in support of a charge so incredibly impudent and absurd, that nothing but the drunken wantonness of power could ever have suggested it, or dared to make it public—the charge, namely, that he had aggravated his other atrocities, by affecting the office of *Universal Lawgiver*! To this masterpiece of perversion, Laud replied in the indignant language, not of conscious innocence, but of conscious merit. He expressed an honest exultation in the accomplishment of his design; and declared that if there was any one action of his life which called for the public gratitude, it was his zealous interference for the improvement and the honour of his University.

“ I wish with all my heart,” he exclaims, “ the times were so open, that I might have the University’s testimony both of me and it. Since I cannot, a great lord in this house, when this charge was laid against me, supplied, in part, their absence; for he was overheard to say to another lord, I think my Lord Archbishop hath done no good work in all his life, but these men will object to it as a crime before they have done !”\*

His eminent rank in the Church now seemed to call upon him for the most decided efforts to suppress the abominable and per-

\* Troubles, &c. p. 305.

icious abuses of the pulpit; and he accordingly prepared himself for an assault upon this strong hold of sedition and fanaticism. He procured the celebrated Royal Declaration against "the perversion of the Articles, to support the doctrines of Calvin or any other individual." By this edict he filled still higher the measure of his iniquities. The fury of the Calvinistic faction knew no bounds. The depths of Satan (they exclaimed) were opened—the Arminians were invited and encouraged to sow their tares—a Jesuitical plot was formed for the subversion of the Gospel, and for the suppression of godly and painful ministers. A petition was accordingly presented to the throne, deprecating this restraint on the *saving* doctrines of God's free Grace in election and predestination, and predicting imminent ruin to the *state* from the followers of that *enemy of God*, Arminius! The raging element seems to have been most intensely concentrated in the Commons. It broke forth in every form of malignant invective. The Scriptures were ransacked for terms of reprobation to brand the Arminian corruptions. The Arminians were a band of desperate conspirators against the honour, the liberty, and the religion of their country. Arminianism, in short, was a prodigy which combined all the abominations of Popery, Despotism, and Impiety. Of this three-headed monster Laud was the keeper, and was ready, at any moment, to unchain it, and let it loose, to hunt and tear in pieces the people of God! Now, be it always scrupulously remembered, by persons who study this portion of our history, that the above language was uttered by men who had not in their whole composition a single element of religious moderation. They were agitated and convulsed by the fiercest spirit of Romish intolerance, at the very moment when they were raving against Rome. They yelled out syllables of dolour and of vengeance against persecution and oppression, and this at the very time when they would gladly have swept away all opposition by fire and sword. They had the effrontery to complain of the *bigotry* of the Church, while they, themselves, regarded a believer in free-will with as much abhorrence as a disbeliever in revelation; and would have committed the preaching of the Gospel to an Atheist as willingly—perhaps more willingly—than they would to an Arminian. And then, on the other hand, let it be kept in mind, that this tremendous burst of fury we are now contemplating, was occasioned solely by an attempt to banish controversy from the pulpit, and to restrain the Calvinising clergy of the Church of England from scattering fire-brands to consume the Establishment and the Monarchy. It is quite notorious, that religious enthusiasm and political discontent were, at that period, in the closest alliance with each other; and at this day, no unprejudiced commentator on history will ever

think of contending, that it was the duty of the hierarchy, or the State, to leave them in unmolested occupation of the strongest position which they could possibly take up. And yet, because Laud, in the midst of all this commotion, saw the path of duty "plain before his face," and spurned away all thoughts of the peril which environed it, he was hunted to death by the agitators of his own time, and his fame has been mangled and disfigured by the agitators of ours!

The wild strife and confusion around him, had no terrors for Laud. To the memorable vote of the Commons, whereby they liberally "rejected the sense of Jesuits, Arminians, and every other which differed from their own," he published a calm and sedate answer, containing certain considerations, which—being rather difficult of digestion—the fanatics affected to consider as unfit even to be tasted! The perfect singleness of heart with which he thus devoted himself to the discharge of his high and dangerous responsibilities, may be inferred from the whole course of his life, and is clearly evinced from the tenor of his correspondence.

"I have always," he says, in a letter to Vossius, "used every endeavour to prevent those dangerous and perplexing questions [about predestination] from becoming public topics of discourse before the people, lest, under the speciousness of defending the truth, we should be doing an injury to godliness and charity. My counsels have ever been those of moderation; with the intention, that men of warm dispositions, whose chief care does not extend to the interests of religion, might not throw all things into confusion. This course of proceeding has probably given some umbrage. But I recollect with what seriousness our Saviour has recommended charity to his followers, and with what caution and patience the Apostle wishes us to treat the weak. If I perish by arts like these, being made a prey to those disputants who gain the victory, (the usual fate of such as adopt moderate counsels,) my reward will be with me; and, except in God, I will seek for no consolation beyond myself."<sup>\*</sup>

And this is the wretch who had no fear of God, and no regard for man!

From this time every unpopular, indiscreet, and violent measure was, without hesitation, and as a matter of course, ascribed to Laud. The pardon of Bishop Montague and others—the violation of the privileges of the Commons by a sheriff's officer—the message of the King to adjourn the House—and, finally, the dissolution of the parliament—all were ascribed to this pestilent heretic and traitor! To his pernicious counsels were ascribed the whole legion of mischiefs which besieged the commonwealth; and a modest proposition was once actually made by Elliott, that the

<sup>\*</sup> Nichols's *Arm. and Calv.* p. 672.

King should be petitioned to leave him and Neile to the justice of the House! It is this period of his life which compels us to pause, and to reflect on the fatal error of investing spiritual persons with arduous secular responsibilities. There can be no doubt that Laud owed his ruin, in a considerable degree, to this mistaken and indefensible practice. Neither Lords, nor Commons, nor populace, could endure to see the post of prime minister filled by an Ecclesiastic. The usage might be tolerated in darker periods, when learning and intelligence were in a great measure confined to the clergy. But those days of ignorance were rapidly passing away. The laity, no longer disqualified by their want of education, for the highest departments of public duty, regarded the intrusion of Churchmen into political office with the bitterest jealousy and disgust. It is deeply to be lamented that Laud did not discern the spirit of the times; or that, perceiving it, he refused to yield to a feeling, which can hardly excite our wonder or condemnation. To a bishop, the most appropriate sphere of action is his diocese; and it might have been well for Laud had his chief care been directed to the administration of his, and if his concern in state affairs had been confined to the occasional and ordinary discharge of his duty as a privy councillor. If, however, he was insensible to this, it would be the grossest of all injustice to ascribe his blindness to the operation of a selfish lust of power. No man, probably, ever felt more deeply than he the weariness and painfulness of political life; and it is altogether marvellous that this feeling did not drive him into the comparative privacy of his ecclesiastical function. But his mind was full of energy and ardour—his courage was inflexible—his zeal for the king's service exalted—and his indignation at the shameful sacrifice of the royal interests, which his position at court was constantly exposing to his view, acted like a fire shut up in his bones, which would not suffer him to rest. He could not have withdrawn himself from the counsels of his sovereign without feeling guilty of ungrateful and treasonable desertion. Even when he retired from the Treasury, (which he did in a twelvemonth after his appointment,) he seemed so utterly unconscionable that the office was unfit for a clergyman, that he laboured to procure Juxon for his successor, and expressed the highest satisfaction on the accomplishment of his purpose. And, assuredly, never was the Exchequer consigned to more able or more honest administration.

In 1630 Laud was chosen Chancellor of the University of Oxford—an honour which only incited him to additional splendour of munificence. The same year was unhappily distinguished for the trial and punishment of the fanatic Leighton, (father to the



archbishop of that name,) the author of a furious and all but treasonable volume, which he was pleased to call "*Zion's Plea against Prelacy.*" The language of this book was such as might be expected from a lunatic. It showed that the author was fitter for Bedlam than the Fleet; and, in fact, the man died insane in 1644. The sentence pronounced upon him was horrible; and it was not only an act of inhumanity, but it was, according to the estimate of that incomparable master of ethics, the Duke of Otranto,\* ten thousand times worse—it was a most egregious blunder! It at once converted a crazy rebel into a holy martyr. It is, however, a most extraordinary circumstance, that this enormity never was laid to the charge of Laud, on his impeachment, though it has since been pressed into the service of the enemies to his memory. It was not produced against him at his trial, though heaven and earth were ransacked for materials of accusation. The repair of St. Paul's Cathedral—the setting up a few fragments of stained glass at Lambeth—the rummaging of an old crucifix out of the regalia—all these worthless remnants and shreds of evidence his persecutors were not ashamed, in their contemptible exigency, to collect and patch together, in order "to make up a show" of plausible arraignment; but not one syllable occurs respecting the monstrous punishment of Leighton, though the man himself was then living, (as *jailor* of Lambeth Palace, at that time converted into a prison,) and ready to be produced. Prynne would have gone a pilgrimage to the world's end to procure such proof in support of this *invaluable* charge. It is said, indeed, by Neale, that when the sentence was passed, Laud pulled off his cap and thanked God for it. Neale's authority for this assertion is Pierce, who found the statement in a despicable pamphlet, not by Ludlow himself, as Mr. Lawson supposes, but published in the name of Ludlow, about fifty years after Laud's death. Till that time the circumstance was never once heard of. And if there was any foundation for the story, it is absolutely incredible that a fact like this should have escaped the scent of the blood-hounds who were seeking the archbishop's life! Dr. Symmons, indeed, the editor of Milton, sagaciously discovers evidence of guilt in the entry of this matter in Laud's Diary, and describes him as "recording, with calm rancour and cold-blooded exultation, the execution of those judicial barbarities." He might just as reasonably conclude from the Diary, that Laud exulted in the assassination of Buckingham; for he records it with just as much apparent coldness of blood as the cropping of Leighton's ears. The Diary, as Dr. Symmons must have known, contains little but a dry mention of facts, without reflection or commentary. And to infer, as he has done, from

\* Fouché.

these, or any other materials which we are in possession of, that Laud actually "dictated the sentence," is a most reprehensible and shameless perversion of historical evidence.

The next important passage in the Bishop's life is his consecration of the Churches of St. Catherine Cree and St. Giles's. We call it *important*, because the circumstances were afterwards produced to eke out the miserable proof of his having traitorously endeavoured to subvert the true religion by the introduction of Popish ceremonies. His answer to this most iniquitous and trumpery charge may be found in his own History of his Trial; and the perusal of it is enough to make one almost ashamed of human nature. We can hardly imagine a more humiliating sight than that of the Grand Inquest of the English nation, sitting day after day, while the patient and unwearied malice of little minds was collecting its paltry ammunition, and stoning its victim to death, as it were, with pebbles. If anything can equal the feeling of scorn occasioned by such a spectacle, it is the disgust excited by a recent endeavour to transfer to Laud the contempt so signally due to his persecutors, and to represent him as a miserable trifler, who could find delight in "performing antics and grimaces in a cathedral." It has been forgotten, or suppressed, that if Laud were "*a ridiculous old bigot*," he shares the honours of that character with names no less illustrious than those of Andrews and of Mede.\* Undoubtedly it is to be wished that he had rigidly confined himself to the appointed rites and ceremonies of the Church, and had abstained from a single practice or gesture on which the most vigilant hostility could fix the charge of innovation. By this wise discretion he might, with infinitely more effect, have discountenanced that sordid slovenliness by which the Puritans had rendered the Protestant worship contemptible and odious; and *by which too, be it always remembered, they were driving multitudes back within the attraction of Romanism.* The fanatics often swaggered into the Church, and sat there with their hats on during divine service. Laud, in his anxiety to correct their brutal irreverence, was desirous that they who entered a Church should testify, by an obeisance, directed towards its most hallowed spot, that they were conscious of entering a precinct dedicated to the Majesty of Heaven. The same feeling prompted him to give

\* "Some bishops," says Gauden, "pleased themselves with a more ceremonious conformity than others observed. . . . Being aged and learned men, and more conversant with the antiquities of the Church than younger ministers, they found that such ceremonious solemnities in religion were then very much used, without any sin or scandal. . . . This, I suppose, made them hope that they might with the like inoffensiveness add such solemnity to sanctity, and such outward veneration to inward devotion; and yet be as far from Popery and superstition as the ancient Christians were." *Gauden's Tears*, &c. quoted *Nic. Arm. and Calv.* p. 702, note †.

peculiar solemnity to the rite of consecration; the fanatics having maintained that the sacredness of the place walked in and walked out together with the congregation. In short, like many other wise and holy men, he apprehended "that religion would grow strangely wild, hirsute, horrid, and incult, like Nebuchadnezzar's hair and nails, if it were left to the boisterous clowneries, and unmannerly liberties, which many would affect, contrary to the public appointment of the Church."\* And therefore it was that he laboured to discourage that pernicious humour which was always ready to burst out into violent alarm, as if "every man went about to cut the throat of the Reformed Religion, who applied scizzars or razor to pare off rudeness and rusticity, or to trim it to any decency of outward ministration."† His zeal in these reforms may possibly have stepped some paces beyond the boundaries of prudence. But surely "a thousand decent ceremonies, such as those enjoyed by the Church of England, do not amount to one Popish opinion; nor are they so heavy as one popular and erroneous principle which tends to licentiousness and profaneness."† It is, therefore, impossible sufficiently to admire the magnanimous contempt of all justice and common sense which could discern, in such matters, a proof of treason or apostasy. It can be exceeded only by the exemplary candour and judgment which, in these days, has laboured to degrade the antagonist of Fisher into a poor and superstitious dotard.

The year 1633 was that of Laud's advancement to the primacy. At London his predecessor had been the passive and indolent Montaigne. At Lambeth he succeeded to the ruined discipline and authority which had been left by Abbot. In either case, therefore, he had to bear a burden, of such formidable accumulation, that it would have bowed down to the earth a less firm and inflexible spirit. His predecessor Abbot, most unfortunately, brought with him to the primacy the theology of Geneva, and probably some secret attachment to her discipline. At all events, if he loved the Church of England, it is most certain that he loved Calvinism infinitely more. He seems, indeed, to have thought that nine-tenths of Christianity were comprized in a detestation for Arminianism and Popery. And accordingly he threw open the gates of the Church for the admission of a tumultuary garrison, animated by a fanatical aversion for the *Anti-Christian* doctrines of general redemption. This fatal relaxation of our ecclesiastical polity he justified to himself by the maxim—"Yield, and they will be pleased at last." When Laud succeeded, he instantly threw himself into the breach, with a directly opposite principle—"Resolve, for there is no end of yielding." The post he under-

\* Gauden's Tears, &c.

† Ibid.

took to maintain was one of tremendous peril. But to him difficulty and danger were words almost without meaning when the times required a vigorous course of action. The discharge of his duty to the Church was to him as the breath of life. And accordingly his very first measure, after his promotion to Canterbury, was the revival of an unpopular canonical regulation, that no person should receive holy orders without a title. That this rule is eminently wise and salutary is evinced by the general adherence to it which has survived to this day. At the time of Laud's advancement its usefulness had received a negative but irresistible proof, in the miserable consequences of its long neglect. It never had been enforced by Abbot; and the result was just what might have been expected: the Church was overrun by a multitude of indigent clerks, wholly unprovided with any regular maintenance: and these clerical adventurers were, at all times, ready to undertake itinerant or other lectureships, and to become the heralds of fanaticism and sedition at the will of their puritanical patrons, on whom they were entirely and most abjectly dependent. The steady application of this rule by his predecessors might, doubtless, have prevented measureless confusion, and protected the Church against the influx of an irregular and independent force, whose operations were ruinous to her discipline and stability. Unhappily, the long disuse of this measure gave to the revival of it by Laud the ungracious aspect of an arbitrary innovation. It was reprobated as a fresh instance of the Archbishop's enmity to all genuine godliness, and of his restless passion for the luxury of despotism. The *real* ground of this furious and vindictive clamour is now evident as the light of heaven. It was fatal to the principle of popular election, which is the very life and soul of Nonconformity, and the very bane of the respectability and *true* independence of the clergy.

The interference of the Archbishop with the foreign Protestant churches in this country, and the attempt to force upon them the offices of the Church of England, are proceedings unquestionably alien from our modern notions and principles of toleration. But Laud lived in an age when the rights of conscience were not held sacred by any one party, either political or religious: and, under such circumstances, who can be surprised that he should honestly regard this exercise of controul as absolutely required by the seditious spirit of the times? To him it appeared intolerable that these congregations, while they were enjoying protection and peace in this country, should set an example of alienation from the National Church; and this at a period when her own children at home were most unnaturally failing in their allegiance towards her. And then it would be the deepest injustice to forget, in *an*

estimate of this and all his measures, his ardent love for the Church of England—his passionate persuasion that she was framed according to the model of apostolic purity and sanctity—and his earnest, though chimerical desire, that her discipline and worship should be spread throughout all Christendom. In the estimation of his adversaries, indeed, this warmth of attachment was among the very blackest of his enormities. In this propensity—as in every word, and deed, and look, and gesture of his—they saw nothing but symptoms of a rooted aversion to the Reformed Faith, and a settled desire for its final overthrow.

The proceedings against Prynne and his brother libellers are too notorious to require a lengthened examination. In these cases, as in that of Leighton, the punishments were frightfully excessive. It is infinitely to be deplored that there was no warning voice to remind the judges of the folly, as well as the cruelty, of punishing men till the sympathies of the world are engaged on their behalf. No writings or ravings of these dogged enthusiasts could have done the government half so much mischief as their public exposure and mutilation. But whatever may have been the absurdity or the barbarity of these inflictions, it is monstrous to heap up their undivided enormity upon the head of Laud. That he approved the sentence is true; but it is also true that he abstained from voting upon it,\* because the virulence of the delinquents had been chiefly directed against himself. And then it ought, in all equity, to be kept in mind, that these coarse operations of penal justice were the relicks of a sanguinary and uncivilized age. They were the excesses rather of the times than of individuals. In the days of Elizabeth, Stubbs had his right hand cut off merely for an address to the queen, in which he somewhat too bluntly urged her majesty to consult the future peace of her kingdoms by an eligible marriage: and as Laud observes, “Penry was hanged, and Udal condemned, and died in prison, for less than is contained in Mr. Burton’s book.”† No one in our own times will ever think of alleging such instances in vindication of

\* His own words are: “In the giving of this sentence I spake my conscience, and was, after, commanded to print my speech. But I gave no vote; because they had fallen so personally upon me, that I doubted many men might think spleen, and not justice, led me to it. . . . Though I did no more than is before mentioned, yet they, and that faction, continued all manner of malice against me: and I had libel upon libel scattered in the streets, and pasted upon posts. And on Friday, July 7, 1637, a note was brought to me of a short libel, pasted on the Cross in Cheapside, that the Archwolf of Canterbury had his hand in persecuting the *saints*, and shedding the blood of the *martyrs*. Now what kind of saints and martyrs these were, may appear by their libellous writings; courses with which saints and martyrs never were acquainted.”—*Troubles and Trials*, pp. 144, 145.

† *Troubles*, &c. p. 145. Penry was the author of Martin Marprelate; and Udal was one of his auxiliaries.

the severity inflicted on Prynne and his associates. But they may very justly be produced to repel the malice which seizes this occasion to picture Laud as a monster of inhumanity, and an enemy to the liberties and the religion of his country.

The inauspicious attempt to introduce the English liturgy, and a body of canons, into Scotland, furnishes another long chapter in the volume of the primate's delinquencies. This subject is of course much too copious and complicated for more than a transient notice of it. It is well known that Scottish Episcopacy was shattered by the iron hand of the Reformation. It was broken to pieces like a potter's vessel. James, indeed, busied himself almost his whole life long in collecting the fragments, and glueing them together again. But the task was well nigh hopeless. There was scarcely a possibility of making a good job of it. He did indeed contrive to cement the ruins in such a manner as to give the fabric something of the semblance of what it once had been. After all, however, it was but a sorry exhibition. The joinings and the patching were all visible. The work had no appearance of grandeur or solidity. It was, evidently, ready to fall to pieces on the very first shock. That shock was given it by the rashness of Charles, when, with an outstretched arm, he presented the detested Service-Book to his northern subjects. The enterprise showed how miserably feeble was James's restoration of the former system. The result of the attempt was, that Episcopacy was soon in the dust—that Scotland was in rebellion—and that the people ran to subscribe the solemn league and covenant as if they were writing their names in the book of life. The temporal power of the crown was made to bow before that dominion, in which kings and nobles are but "God's silly vassals;" and the Presbyterian Kirk was raised up in such glory, that she was vaunted to be—"fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners!"

The history of Scotland at this period is, it must be confessed, altogether sufficiently revolting. The truth seems to be, that the inordinate wealth of the Popish Church of Scotland—the profligacy, arrogance, and idleness of its hierarchy—and the despicable ignorance of its clergy—all these together had made the savour of Episcopacy to be so utterly abhorred, that the re-action against it kept the kingdom in a state of agitation for considerably more than a century after. The least fragment of it caused their stomachs to heave, and "cast the gorge." The bowels which were not offended or disturbed by the coarseness, blasphemy, ribaldry, and nonsense of the Presbyterian preachers, were thrown into convulsions by a particle or a drop of the original regimen. As Prynne had declared in England that Christ was a Puritan, so the anti-



prelatists in Scotland discovered that Christ was a Covenanter. The covenant was Christ's marriage contract. They who refused to subscribe it were atheists; and it was maintained from the pulpit, that "the wrath of God would never leave the kingdom till all the prelates were hanged up before the Lord, like the seven sons of Saul." While men were in this temper, it was not wonderful that they should look with an eye of positive fury on all the confidential advisers of the king. Neither was it all surprising that the utmost intensity of their wrath should be directed against the English primate, by whose advice all ecclesiastical measures were supposed to be adopted and conducted.

Their vengeance accordingly embodied itself in the form of a set of Articles, which their commissioners presented to the House of Lords on the 16th December, 1640, and challenging the Prelate of Canterbury as the prime cause on earth of the pernicious innovations which had been recently attempted in their country. The answer which he prepared to those charges may be found in the *History of his Trial and Troubles*\*—a work which he drew up in the Tower with great care; but which Burnet, in his careless, gossiping, hasty manner, consigns to utter contempt, probably on a very superficial examination of its contents. This sweeping censure was too much even for Warburton; as it must be, we should imagine, for every one who will carefully peruse Laud's noble vindication of himself against the Scottish Articles. For ourselves, we confess we are lost in astonishment at the effrontery or the infatuation which can dare to speak of "the abject imbecility of the intellect" which could produce this defence. To us it appears scarcely possible that any mind, not absolutely deranged by its prejudices, should contemplate this effort without admiration, especially when it is remembered that its author was verging towards his seventieth year, when he was thus tied to the stake, to be "baited with the rabble's curse." Every one must surely be struck with its blunt and vigorous eloquence—with its profound erudition—with its consummate mastery over all the topics involved in the accusation—with the consciousness of integrity which breathes in every line—with the high-minded scorn which it manifests for the combination of malice and ignorance frequently betrayed in the proceedings of his adversaries—with the honest indignation with which it hurls back the stupid and shameless calumny, that he had acted like a traitor to the religious liberties of England and of Scotland, and that he bore within his bosom the heart of an Apostate. That he was in correspondence with the Scottish bishops respecting certain projected alterations, he avows; that the intended Canons were submitted to him for

\* Page 87—143.

revisal, he likewise confesses; neither does he attempt to disguise that he assisted in the preparation of the Service-book. But he denies distinctly that he obtruded himself into these offices. He acted throughout by the express injunction of the king; and, with regard to the Liturgy, he declares that his own wish was to introduce that of England unaltered; that, finding this would hardly be endured, he desired to decline all further concern in it; but that, being commanded to assist, he gave his best attention to make them as perfect as might be. It is likewise true that he seems, throughout, to glory in the work, and deeply to regret its failure.

"I will never deny," he exclaims, "the joy, while I live, that I conceived of the Church of Scotland's coming nearer, both in the Canons and the Liturgy, to the Church of England. But our gross unthankfulness both to our God and our King, and our other many and great sins, have hindered this great blessing. And I pray God that the loss of this, which was now almost effected, do not, in a short time, prove one of the greatest mischiefs which ever befel *this* kingdom, and *that* too."\*

Again:—

"The worst thought I had of any reformed Church in Christendom, was to wish it like the Church of England, and so much better as it should please God to make it. . . . And I hope that was neither to negotiate for Rome—nor to reduce them to heresy in doctrine—nor to superstition and idolatry in worship—no, nor to tyranny in government; all which are here most wrongfully imputed to me. And the comparing of me to the Pope himself I could bear with more ease, had I not written more against Popish superstition *than any Presbyterian of Scotland hath done*. And for my part I could be contented to lay down my life to-morrow, upon condition the Pope and Church of Rome would admit and confirm that Service-book, which hath been here so eagerly charged against me. For, were that done, it would give a greater blow to Popery (which is but the corruption of the Church of Rome) than any that hath yet been given; and that they know full well. . . . The reformed churches had need look well to themselves; for if they came out of Babel to run down to Egypt, they'll get little by the bargain."†

Whether or not this is the language of a mistaken man, may fairly be open to discussion. But we feel quite certain that it is the language of a most able, sincere, and honest man—of a man who imagined that he was employed in devising blessings for the Scottish people, not in forging chains for their bodies and souls; of a man who believed himself engaged in a work which entitled him to gratitude, and not to hatred and persecution unto death.

We cannot forbear to add one more extract, illustrative of the admirable wisdom and moderation of his views on an important point of discipline. The Scotch complained that he had pro-

\* Troubles, &c. p. 100.

† Ibid. pp. 134, 135.

posed to omit from the canons the clause by which a minister was to be *deposed*, if he were found *negligent* in converting Papists.

“ I did think,” he says, “ to leave out this on two grounds. The one, that the word *negligent* is too general an expression, and of too large an extent to lay a minister open to deposition. And if Church governors should forget Christian moderation, a very worthy minister might sometimes be undone for a very little negligence. . . . The other ground why I omitted this clause is, because I do not think the Church of Scotland, or any other particular Church, so blessed in her priests, as that every of her ministers is, for learning, and judgment, and temper, able and fit to convert Papists. And therefore I did think then, and do think yet, that it is not so easy a work, or to be made so common, but that it is, and may be, much fitter for some able and selected men to undertake. And if any man think God’s gifts in him to be neglected, (as men are apt to overvalue themselves,) let them try their gifts, and labour their conversion, in God’s name. But let not the Church by a canon set every man at work, lest their weak and indiscreet performance hurt the cause, and blemish the Church.”\*

It is remarkable that in this answer, Laud maintains and avows, with the utmost confidence, the unlawfulness of resistance to constituted authority. He does not appear to consider it as a questionable doctrine. Though the enemy was boarding him, he never thought, for a moment, of hauling down these obnoxious colours. The Scotch had complained, that “ for their protestations, and other lawful means which they used for their deliverance, Canterbury procured them to be proclaimed rebels.” That he procured them to be so proclaimed he positively denies: that he so considered, and so spoke of them, he broadly admits.

“ Truly,” he says, “ I know of no *lawful* means that they used, but taking up arms against the king; and I, for my part, do not conceive that lawful for subjects to do in any cause, of religion or otherwise. *And this, I am sure, was the ancient Christian doctrine.* . . . They say that I did openly and often speak of them as of rebels and traitors. That, indeed, is true. I did so. And I spake of them as I then thought, and as I think still. For it was as desperate a plotted treason as ever was in any nation. And if they did not think so themselves, what needed their act of oblivion in Scotland? or the like in England, to secure their abettors here?”†

We are far from producing this passage in the expectation, or the wish, that the obsolete and unpopular doctrine in question may find grace in the sight of the present generation. We advert to it purely as indicating the noble and unabated courage of the aged prelate; his profound reliance on the justness of his own principles; and his belief that the times demanded an unreserved avowal

\* Troubles, &c. p. 103.

† Ibid. pp. 125, 126.

of those principles, even in the very jaws of destruction. Armed, however, as he was in honesty, it was needful, at all events, that he should be immolated. It was necessary, in the first instance, to remove from the presence of the king a faithful and intrepid counsellor, who would loudly and solemnly protest against the sacrifice of Strafford—one who would not, like Williams, tell his sovereign that he had a private conscience and a public conscience, and that, on matters of public import, he was at liberty to consult the latter, and to disregard the former; but one who would plead, trumpet-tongued, against the deep damnation of abandoning to destruction a faithful, devoted, and heroic servant; one, in short, who would join with honest Juxon in speaking to him of the authority of conscience as *one and indivisible*, and in adjuring him, as he valued his present honour and his eternal peace, to perish under the ruins of his palace, rather than consent to violate its dictates. This service the adamant integrity of Laud might have rendered to his sovereign in that hour of darkness. But the children of disobedience were wise in their generation. They saw how necessary it was to deprive the king's unsteady virtue of its best support, and Laud was accordingly despatched to the Tower. It was further necessary, as Ludlow remarks, that the primate should be sacrificed *for the encouragement of the Scotch*; and it was moreover highly expedient that religion should enter largely into his impeachment, since otherwise it might be difficult to maintain the exasperation of the people against their victim. Accordingly both English and Scotch addressed themselves to the work with a sympathy and unity of purpose, which never was more perfectly exemplified in a knot of blood-hounds. Prynne was the leader of the chase, and his voice was heard, baying more loudly and furiously than all the rest; and though he could no longer “prick up his predestinating ears,” his nostril, “sagacious of the quarry,” was in restless and incessant quest. With all this keenness and perseverance, the pack were often grievously at fault. Their wishes, indeed, were *swift to shed blood*; but the scent lay so dull and cold, that their steps were tediously slow; and any thing but revolutionary malice must have been baffled and reduced to despair. It is satisfactory to know that, in the present age, these atrocities are pretty generally consigned to the infamy they deserve. They are reprobated by Mr. Hallam. They are condemned even by his commentator and admirer. They are viewed with abhorrence by all who retain an unperverted sense of righteousness and humanity. With regard to the general merits of the Long Parliament, there may be, at this hour, every possible shade and variety of opinion. But where is the man who can re-

flect on their brutal and shameless oppression of Laud, without feeling the truth of the exclamation,

————— “ ῥόλια βελευτήρια,  
ψευδῶν ἄνακτες, μηχανοῤῥαφοὶ κακῶν,  
ἔλικτα, κ’ οὐδὲν ὕγιες, ἀλλὰ πᾶν πέριξ  
φοροῦντες—ἀδίκως εὐτυχεῖτ’ ἄν’ Ἑλλάδα.”\*

And what bosom does not echo the solemn meditations of our own poet,† on this disgraceful sacrifice?

“ Pursued by Hate, debarred from friendly care ;  
An old weak man for vengeance thrown aside,  
Long ‘ in the painful art of dying’ tried,  
(Like a poor bird entangled in a snare,  
Whose heart still flutters, though his wings forbear  
To stir in useless struggle,) Laud relied  
Upon the strength which Innocence supplied,  
And in his prison breathed celestial air.  
Why tarries then thy chariot? Wherefore stay,  
O Death! the ensanguined yet triumphant wheels,  
Which thou prepar’st, full often, to convey,  
(What time a State with madding faction reels)  
The Saint or Patriot to the world that heals  
All wounds, all perturbations doth allay?”

We cannot forbear to dwell for a moment on the mode of procedure against the archbishop, as furnishing a magnificent specimen of the justice of revolutionary tribunals. It would seem as if the malice of his assailants, baffled by the difficulty of finding matter against him, indemnified itself by calculating on his demolition at the rate of so many grains a day. He was committed on the 18th December, 1640. He remained in the custody of the Black Rod for ten weeks, at a ruinous charge to himself, before the articles of impeachment were brought up to the Lords. On the 26th February, 1641, the articles were exhibited. On the first of March he was committed to the Tower, and there he actually was kept for nearly *three years*, without a trial, to the imminent danger of his health and the dilapidation of his fortunes. During this period the work of persecution and confiscation went vigorously forward. An assessment of £16,000 was imposed on his estates, by way of damages to Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, and a fine of £20,000 for his share in the proceedings of the Convocation, in enacting canons after the dissolution of parliament, although this measure was not ventured upon without the express sanction of the crown lawyers. In other respects too he was treated like one whose guilt was already established. He was stripped of the ecclesiastical patronage attached to the pri-

\* Eurip. *Androm.*

† Wordsworth.

macy. His revenues were sequestered, his palace seized, and himself exposed to the miseries of indigence and privation; reduced to the necessity of petitioning for an allowance out of his own property, and, at last, of living, in a considerable measure, on the bounty of his friends. To complete this course of outrageous iniquity, his papers at Lambeth were seized. His apartments in the Tower, and even his very pockets, were rifled by Prynne, under a parliamentary warrant; and a mass of papers, which he had prepared for his defence, together with his Diary and prayer-book, were taken from him; and, lastly, the books of the Council Table, Star Chamber, High Commission, &c., were (as he complains) exquisitely searched for matter against him, and yet he was wholly denied the use of them for the purposes of his vindication! And thus it was that, to use his own expression, he was "sifted to the very bran." And yet he exclaims,

"I am thus far glad even of this sad accident; for by my Diary your lordships have seen the passages of my life; and by my prayer book the greatest secrets between God and my soul; so that you may be sure that you have me at the very bottom. Yet, blessed be God, no disloyalty is found in the one, no popery in the other."\*

For three years was the aged archbishop thrown aside to languish in prison without a trial. And when the hate of his enemies was at leisure to remember him, the indefatigable malignity of Prynne was employed to put together the pieces of *this broken business*. To Prynne, likewise, was entrusted the marshalling of the evidence—to Prynne the most inveterate of the prelate's enemies—to Prynne, who notoriously "kept a kind of school of instruction" for the preparation of the witnesses, wherein his "tampering was so palpable and foul," that one who was a stranger to Laud, said that "he could not but pity him, and cry shame upon it."† At one time the spirit of the archbishop was nearly sinking under the weight of this detestable conspiracy, and he had even some thoughts of "deserting his defence." This despondency, however, he speedily shook off, and fixed his hopes, under God, upon the "honour and justice of the Lords," who were to try him. The trial came—and then it was apparent that, to rely on their integrity, was to lean on the staff of a broken reed. The following statement must surely consign to everlasting contempt the august body which sat in judgment on the archbishop.

"It did trouble me," he says, "to see so few lords in that great house. For, at the greatest presence there was, any day of my hearing, there were not above *fourteen*, and usually not above eleven or twelve. Of these, one-third each day took or had occasion to depart before the charge of the day was half given. *I never had any one day the same*

\* Troubles, &c. p. 412.

† Ibid. p. 219.



*lords all the morning*: some leading lords scarce present at my charge *four days* of all my long trial, *or three* at my defence; and, which is most, *no one lord present* at my whole trial, but the Lord Gray of Wark, the speaker!"\*

When the hearing came on, the charge against him usually lasted till two o'clock. He was allowed till *four* only to prepare his answer, scarcely time enough to peruse the evidence, and his counsel were not permitted to come to him till his answer had been made. His witnesses were not allowed to be sworn, and after his answer one or more of the committee replied upon him. By this time it was generally about half past seven; and then, weary and exhausted, and with his clothes wringing with perspiration, he was obliged to go back in the evening by water to the Tower.† Such was the treatment of the Primate of all England, before the assembly of his peers; and this too when he was bowing under age and infirmity, and worn down with a life of anxiety and toil. His mighty spirit, however, bore him bravely and stiffly up, under all hardships and indignities; and he says himself, "I humbly thank God he so preserved my health, that I never had so much as half an hour's headache or other infirmity all the time of this comfortless and tedious trial."

On the 2d of November he was summoned to the bar of the Commons, (being held no longer entitled to the privileges of a peer,) and was told by the speaker that an ordinance was drawn up to attain him of high treason, but that they would not pass it till they had heard a summary of the whole charge; which was accordingly delivered. On the 11th November he was allowed to pronounce his defence; and this he did with such consummate ability, such intrepid bearing, and such evident consciousness of innocence and high-desert, that it won him the admiration of all men, and extorted expressions of wonder and commendation even from Prynne himself. The rest of his history is too well known to need repetition. He poured out his soul unto death with the calmness that became a Christian bishop; and to this day his blood cries out of the dust against the wickedness which sought his life.

And does not his memory cry out as loudly against the malice which has pursued it from that time to this? Is it not wonderful that any one should now be found to declare himself persuaded, that Laud was in his heart a deliberate enemy to the liberties and the religion of his country? We are not so insane as to undertake the vindication of all his measures. We venture on nothing so desperate as the defence of every article of his political creed. We are willing, at least for the sake of argument, to surrender

\* Troubles, &c. p. 217, 218.

† Ibid. p. 218.

his theory of the constitution to the *tender mercies* of the most licentious modern whiggery. Our souls have no delight in the spectacle of episcopacy invested with the robe of political or religious inquisition. We reflect with no complacency on the apparition of a churchman, holding the crozier in one hand, and the seals of civil office in the other. We heartily rejoice that the elements of our polity have at least fallen into a combination, which can scarcely ever produce or endure a repetition of such phenomena. But these avowals we hold to be perfectly consistent with our veneration for the memory of Laud, and with a cordial abhorrence for the virulent and contemptuous spirit which still frequently assails his name.

To his alleged political delinquencies it cannot be necessary to revert at length. With regard to them, the whole case lies in the compass of a nutshell. His own natural disposition, it may be conceded, was somewhat arbitrary and austere. He could look with no indulgence on whatever tended towards anarchy and confusion. His principles as a churchman were in harmony with this temper. As he, and as most divines then read the Scriptures, rebellion was one form of impiety; and resistance to the prince, was treason against heaven. No wonder then that he watched with emotions of dismay the spirit which was then abroad, and which, as he believed, was threatening the church and the monarchy with destruction. No wonder if he wrought himself into a full and honest conviction that "*thorough*" and decisive measures were required to guard from invasion the legal rights of the throne, and to preserve the empire from ruin and dishonour. We eschew the temerity and hardihood of affirming that his views as a statesmen were always wise, or that his mode of prosecuting them was uniformly prudent. A burning zeal and a choleric temperament overpowered, occasionally, his better judgment: but it is the cruellest of all injustice, to ascribe his errors to the influence of a cankered and malignant heart. He has been charged with traitorous designs against the *fundamental laws* of the country. We are satisfied, on the contrary, that his design was to support the *fundamental laws*, as they were understood by himself and by other illustrious men of his day. And they who hate his memory most bitterly must allow that his purposes were wholly untainted with sordid and worldly wisdom. He followed his convictions honestly, faithfully, and courageously. No perversion has yet been able to defraud him of the praise of disinterestedness, or to fix upon him the guilt of selfish duplicity and falsehood.

But the ravings of the malcontent have always been directed mainly against Laud's administration of the Church. It is here

that the features and the attributes of the evil Spirit are said to be most fearfully discernible! He has been painted as the presiding demon of the Star-Chamber; as the arch-fiend of the English inquisition; as a monster that never was at rest unless he had "*Puritans to pillory and to mangle.*" On this matter a word or two may be expedient, because we suspect that to this day there is much confusion of thought prevailing upon it, in spite of all that has been said or written upon the subject.

It must here be remembered, then, that the administration of church government in those days involved two distinct objects: first, the treatment of such persons as came under the general description of sectarians, or separatists; and second, the exaction of uniformity in the celebration of public worship within the Established Church.

Now with regard to the former of these two objects, it is hardly possible at this day for any mortal to open his lips in palliation of the conduct of such men as Whitgift, Bancroft, and Laud, without being saluted with a shout of derision and mockery. We live in an age which recognizes the right of every individual to leave the Church for the Conventicle, and the Conventicle for the Church, or to divide his favours impartially between them, or to abandon both Church and Conventicle altogether. The consequence is, that most men have lost the faculty of comprehending that there ever could be a time, when it was thought lawful and right to punish or to molest individuals for worshipping God conformably to the dictates of their conscience or their caprice. It is needful, therefore, to remind them that there have been such times; and that as the law then stood, it fell within the positive duty of ecclesiastical governors to animadvert upon revolt and defection from the national communion. It may further be confessed, that they sometimes addressed themselves to the discharge of this duty with a zeal and ardour scarcely credible in these days of liberal indifference; and that, when examined by the light we now enjoy, their proceedings were occasionally such as might appear to wear a fierce and unfeeling aspect. It must lastly be stated, that the tribunals, by which those proceedings were chiefly carried on, were of an arbitrary and dangerous nature, and have since been indignantly swept away from the constitution.

It may possibly be asked, how oppression like this could ever be endured? and the answer is, that it was not endured very patiently; *and by none so impatiently as by those who "hotly lusted" to inflict the same oppression themselves;* whose fingers were actually quivering with eagerness to grasp the two-edged sword of temporal and spiritual authority. It has been said by Warburton that Laud was for an arbitrary king, and for an in-

*tolerant* church. We should be glad to know who, in those days, was *not* for an intolerant church? If the prelates were for an intolerant church, that many-headed bishop, the presbytery, was for a church beyond all comparison more intolerant. The persecuted saints detested the rulers of the episcopal establishment, not merely as tyrants, but as usurpers. Their complaint was that the meek and holy ones of the earth were kept out of their inheritance by hirelings and apostates. They looked forward with sickening expectation to those blessed times when the secular arm should be at the command of God's elect, and execute his righteous judgments upon heretics, prelatists, and all other enemies of holiness. A system of indulgence and toleration they loudly scorned and denounced as an abomination and a snare; as no less than a perfidious abandonment of the cause of truth. And when their day was come, most luminous and faithful was the *practical* commentary which they put forth upon the texts that had been eternally in their mouths! All this is perfectly notorious: and all this must be distinctly in the mind of every speculator of our history. And yet we find the memory of such men as Laud made a *hissing and a curse*; as if intolerance were exclusively the vice of the rulers of the Establishment; as if the sectarians sought only the peaceable enjoyment of their own tiresome absurdities; and as if the faction, who cried out against the inhuman bigotry of the Church, had any other object under heaven, but to secure for themselves a strict monopoly in the privilege of persecution.

The enforcement of uniformity in the services and ceremonies of the Church was another object of ecclesiastical administration: and nothing can be more outrageously absurd than the clamour against the hierarchy for their faithful discharge of this duty. That we may be able to comprehend this the more clearly, let us consider for a moment what we should think of any bishop of modern days who should surrender the rites and formularies of the Church to the caprices or the scruples which might at any time be wandering up and down his diocese? What should we say if he were to suffer his clergy to use, or to omit, at their pleasure, the cross in baptism, or the ring in matrimony, or the surplice at the desk or the altar; or should allow the communion table to be dragged from the eastern wall into the middle of the Church, at the fancy of dissenting or radical churchwardens? And what right could men have to murmur in those days, if the supreme authorities enforced, in these particulars, a compliance with the law of the land, and with the usages and the canons of the Establishment? And how, more especially, could the members of the clerical body have the effrontery to complain of habits and of ceremonies, their compliance with which they knew to be an express condition of

their being allowed to enter the ministry? The matter may, perhaps, be best illustrated by reference to another profession. Let us, then, imagine some captain, of paralytic conscience, to appear before his colonel for military nonconformity; and to state, in his defence, that he was Christ's soldier and servant—that he had renounced all worldly pomp and vanity—that, accordingly, he begged, among other things, especially to protest against the abominations of lace and embroidery, and to represent that a man can fight as stoutly for his king in drab dittos, as in regimental foppery. We need hardly suggest what would be the answer of the commandant, and how utterly unmoved he would be by all outcry against the wickedness of molesting and cashiering brave men for the sake of frogs and tinsel. And why should greater respect be due to clerical consciences which might be afflicted by that livery of superstition, the hood and surplice? But upon this matter let us hear Laud himself.

“All I laboured for in this particular was, that the external worship of God in this Church might be kept up in uniformity and decency, and in some beauty of holiness. And this the rather, because first I found that, from the contempt of the outward worship of God, the inward fell away apace, and profaneness began boldly to show itself. And, secondly, because I could speak with no conscientious persons, almost, that were wavering in religion, but the great motive which wrought upon them to disaffect, or think meanly of the Church of England, was that the external worship of God was so lost in the Church, (as they conceived it,) and the churches themselves, and all things in them suffered to lye in such a base and slovenly fashion in most places of the kingdom. These, and no other considerations, moved me to take so much care as I did of it; which was with a single eye, and most free from any Romish superstition. *As for ceremonies, all that I enjoined were according to law.*”\*

Where then—we should be glad to ask of whig, or radical, or liberal, or nonconformist, or free-thinking Christian—where is the bigotry and the despotism of the Archbishop's proceedings? and where, among modern legislators, or even lawyers, could be found the impudence which should thrust such matters as these into an impeachment of high treason? But it was the peculiar misery of Laud to succeed a prelate who *cared for none of these things*. Whether from indolence, or from timidity, or from a contempt for the decent solemnities of divine worship, or from his admiration of the whole pandects of the Calvinistic system, Abbot had suffered a shameful waste and dilapidation to overrun the lawful discipline of the Establishment. He had suffered the sacred edifices to become so ruinous and filthy, that they almost caused the services of the Lord to be abhorred. He permitted the commu-

\* Troubles, &c. p. 150.

nion table to remain in the body of the church, wholly unprotected from perpetual desecration and pollution. He allowed the hallowed enclosure of the Establishment to be haunted by every form and variety of disorder. It was the fate of Laud to perform a lustration of the violated sanctuary, and to cast out the unclean and hateful things which had made their dwelling there; and the ignorant rabble were, accordingly, taught to curse him, not only as the minister of tyranny, but as the hierophant of superstition.

A more serious accusation against him is, that he cruelly vexed and persecuted the painful and godly ministers of the Gospel. The plain truth of this matter is, that he used the powers which the law put into his hand for the suppression of polemical and inflammatory preaching, which was then employed to send into every corner of the realm a spirit of frantic disaffection to the hierarchy and the throne. And beyond all question, if the sanctuary were to be desecrated by similar abuses at the present day, the case would be eminently fit for the paternal castigation of the diocesan, or for the more vigorous good offices of his majesty's attorney-general. It never could be endured for a moment, that virulent libels against Church and State should be vented from the chair of spiritual instruction; or that the pulpit should be converted into the rostrum of sedition. Neither can it be doubted, that it would have been a cowardly abandonment of duty if the Primate of all England, in those times, had looked passively on, while faction and fanaticism were taking counsel together, and strengthening the hands of each other. The tribunals then resorted to for the suppression of such outrages were, indeed, formidably adverse to the liberties of the country. But Laud found them established; and it would be the consummation of absurdity and injustice to make him answerable for the vices of their constitution. But on this point, again, let us hear the accused speak for himself; and then let us say whether his accusers ought not to have blushed for their iniquity.

"I have not by myself, nor by my command to my officers, silenced, suspended, deprived, degraded, or excommunicated any learned, pious, and orthodox preachers, but upon just cause proved in court, *and according to law*. . . . Nor have I, by their suspensions, hindered the preaching of God's word, but of *schism and sedition*; as now appears plainly by the sermons frequently made in London\* since the time of liberty given and taken, since this parliament first began. . . . And whereas in their late remonstrance they say—the *high commission grew to such excess of sharpness and severity as was not much less than the Romish Inquisition, and yet, in many cases, by the Archbishop's power was made much more heavy, being*

\* A very curious collection of specimens of puritanical eloquence may be found in Nicolls' Arminianism and Calvinism compared.



*assisted and strengthened by the authority of the council-table—I was much troubled at it, that such an imputation from so great a body should be fastened on me. . . . Therefore, to satisfy myself and others in this particular, I did cause a diligent search to be made in the Acts of that court, (which can deceive no man,) what suspensions, deprivations, and other punishments had passed in the seven years of my time before my commitment. Then I compared them with every one of the three seven years of my immediate predecessor (Abbot)—for so long he sat, and somewhat over, and was in great esteem with the House of Commons all his time—and I find more by three suspended, deprived, or degraded, in every seven years of his time, than in the seven years of my time, so cried out upon for sharpness and severity, even to the equalling of that commission almost to the Romish Inquisition. So safe a thing it is for a man to embark himself into a potent faction; and so hard for any other man, be he never so intire, to withstand its violence.”\**

We should hardly have been tempted to revert to such topics as these, had it not been lately asserted, that a schism about trifles, in the time of Elizabeth and of the first Stuarts, was converted by *persecution* into a systematic political opposition. We protest against this representation, as most egregiously insidious and unjust; as tending to arm all the resentments of mankind against the Church, and to engage all their sympathies on the part of the Presbyterians. It would be a much more righteous statement of the case to say, that the opposition in question was, mainly, the result of a struggle for existence on the part of the Establishment, and for supremacy on the part of the Nonconformists. The malcontent faction was, for a time, defeated; and, of course, it was filled with “unconquerable hate;” and became, at length, the natural sanctuary for all the turbulence which before might happen to be afloat in the political system. And hence the conflict, which terminated in the overthrow of the Church and the Monarchy. That Calvinism and Presbyterianism are “*no such monsters*” at the present day, *may* very possibly be true. Time and circumstances may have done much to tame them. At the period in question, however, their claws were sharp, and their fangs venomous, and their temper desperately savage. It was necessary to protect the public against their furious and destructive aggressions: and the measures taken for this purpose were not so much measures of persecution, as measures of precaution and self-defence. To change our illustration:—the fruits which, in their early growth, were corrosive and deleterious, are at present, perhaps, comparatively mild and innocent. *Crudi posuere pericula succi*. But we must not too hastily condemn those who manifested the most violent aversion and disgust at the austerity of their original flavour.

\* Troubles, &c. pp. 163, 164.

Of all the repulsive peculiarities of the Holy Discipline, as it exhibited itself in those days, there was none, perhaps, so remarkable as its coarse and hard-featured resemblance to the Popery, which was the object of its professed abhorrence. The Presbyterian system was, in its principles, as sternly and avowedly intolerant as the Pontifical chair. It extended no hope of salvation beyond the pale of its own communion. It affected a dominion paramount to all earthly magistracy. It proclaimed a war of extermination against heresy. It was ready to compass earth and sea for proselytes. Violence and terror were employed to establish its infallibility; and if Popery had its Council of Trent, Calvinism had its Synod of Dort. If it abjured the idolatry of the mass, it may fairly be said to have found a substitute in the ordinance of preaching;\* for, to the Presbyterian, the sermon was almost as much the life and soul of public worship, as the sacrifice of the Eucharist was to the Catholic. If it renounced altogether the *merit* of ritual performances, it seemed to indemnify itself by setting up, instead, the *merit* of neglecting them. Lastly, if the Romish discipline tended to transfer the care of men's consciences from the sinner to the priest, precisely similar to this was the effect of the System of Geneva—if we may trust to the representation of it by Milton; who has left us a picture of the domestic conscience-keeper, touched with inimitable force of caustic humour. As the prose works of Milton are not now in the hands of every one, we are quite certain that our readers will be glad to see it introduced here.

“A man may be a heretic in the truth; and if he believe things *only* because his pastor says so, or the Assembly so determines, without knowing other reason, though his belief be true, yet the very truth he holds becomes his heresy. There is not any burden that some would gladlier put off to another, than the charge and care of their religion. There be—who knows not that there be?—of *Protestants and professors, who live in as arrant and implicit faith, as any lay Papist of Loretto*. A wealthy man, addicted to his pleasures and to his profits, finds religion to be a traffic so entangled, and of so many piddling accounts, that, of all myste-

\* The almost superstitious estimation in which preaching was held by the Puritans, is thus adverted to by Laud in his Conference.

“I have often heard some wise men say, that the Jesuit in the Church of Rome and the precise party in the Reformed Churches agree in many things, though they would seem most to differ. And surely this is one: for both of them differ extremely about tradition; the one in magnifying it, and exalting it into Divine authority; the other vilifying it, and depressing it almost beneath human. And yet, even in these different ways, both agree in this consequent: *that the sermons and preachings by word of mouth of the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the Church are able to breed in us Divine and infallible faith; nay, are the very word of God*. And no less than so, have some accounted their own factious words as the word of God. . . . And it may be observed too, that no men are more apt to say that all the Fathers were but men, and might err, than they that think their own preachings are infallible.”—*Conference with Fisher*, p. 100.

ries, he cannot skill to keep a stock going upon that trade. What should he do? Fain would he have the name to be religious, fain he would bear up with his neighbours in that. What does he, therefore, but resolves to give over toiling, and to find himself out some factor, to whose care and credit he may commit the whole managing of his religious affairs; some divine of note and estimation that must be. To him he adheres, resigns the whole warehouse of his religion, with all the locks and keys, into his custody; and, indeed, makes the very person of that man his religion; esteems his associating with him a sufficient evidence and commendatory of his own piety. So that a man may say, his religion is now no more within himself, but is become an individual moveable, and goes and comes near him, according as that good man frequents the house. He entertains him, gives him gifts, feasts him, lodges him. His religion comes home at night, prays, is liberally supped, and sumptuously laid to sleep; rises, is saluted; and (after the malmsey, or some well-spiced brewage, and better breakfasted than He, whose morning appetite would have gladly fed on green figs between Bethany and Jerusalem) his religion walks abroad at eight, and leaves his kind entertainer in the shop,—trading without his religion!”\*

Such being the notorious character and tendency of the *Calvinistic* fanaticism, we may readily imagine the indignation and disdain of the *Arminian* Laud, on finding himself assailed and hunted down as the confederate of Popery. The preceding outline of his history will enable us to trace the rise and progress of this despicable slander: and every one, conversant with those times, must now perceive, that, to charge him with a design to subvert the Protestant religion, would be about as reasonable, as to affirm that he was a party to the Gunpowder Plot. The calumny, however, did its office. The falsehood was eminently serviceable in its day; and (as he himself complains) contributed more to his ruin than double of all the other machinations against him. Even to this hour, it carries on a sort of ambushed warfare against his fame. The inaccurate, or superficial student of history, is still apt to rise with a secret, undefined impression, that there must, after all, have been something unsound in the religious principles of a man who, all his life long, was gored and worried by a faction that seemed to thirst incessantly for the blood of *Papists*. And thus it is that his memory has been defrauded of due reverence and honour, and that the Church has lost a portion of that strength which she derives from the fame of her most illustrious fathers.

Among the circumstances which in his own time greatly strengthened the belief of his apostasy, was the offer of a cardinal's hat, made to him on the very morning that his predecessor,

\* Milton's *Areopag. Prose Works*, vol. i. p. 316, Ed. Symm. This was written in 1645, when the Church was depressed, and the Presbyterian system triumphant.

Abbot, expired. The affair, unquestionably, has, at first sight, a very odd appearance; and, to our apprehension, the mystery is not instantly cleared up by the nature of the Archbishop's demeanour on the occasion. If, at this day, a person, professing to be an emissary of Rome, were to wait on the Primate of all England with a similar proposal, His Grace would, probably, lose no time in bowing the gentleman out of the room; and having done so, he would, doubtless, congratulate himself on having got rid of a visitor not altogether right in his mind! Nothing could be more different from this than the conduct of Laud. He seems to have betrayed neither astonishment, nor indignation, nor disturbance of any kind. He calmly replied to the person who came to him in secret with the offer, that "something dwelt within him which would not suffer that, till Rome was otherwise than it was at the present time."\* To us such an answer seems, at first sight, strangely ambiguous and faint. We should perhaps have expected that he would meet the proposal much in the same manner that St. Basil or St. Ambrose would have received an offer of election into the College of Augurs or Pontifices: whereas, the language of his refusal seems to imply that there was nothing extravagantly absurd in the arrangement; and that, if Rome would but submit to some material reforms in her system, the Archbishop of Canterbury might, without any violation of consistency, become a member of the sacred conclave.

A moment's consideration may be sufficient to solve what, at first sight, appears absolutely inexplicable. In the present age, a reconciliation between the Romish and the Protestant communities appears to be as utterly chimerical, as a coalition between the religion of the Cross and that of the Crescent. A *Protestant Cardinal* sounds, to our ears, almost as strange as a *Christian Imâm*. But, in the days of Laud, the case was widely different. The breach between the Churches was then by no means universally regarded as altogether desperate.† It was, indeed, a most

\* Diary, p. 49.

† The prevalent feeling, that the breach with Rome was not absolutely irreparable, may help to account for the very courteous and complimentary style of intercourse which was occasionally kept up with her by some distinguished Protestants. Sully relates‡ that he received from Paul V. a singularly flattering epistle, conceived in the strongest terms of esteem and admiration, but expressive of ardent wishes for his conversion. On the topic of conversion, Sully, in reply, says not one syllable; but, in the matter of compliment, he pays his holiness in his own coin; and even talks of the honour of *kissing his feet*: a strain of civility which, he confesses, might rather discompose his Protestant friends. It is well known that James I. considered himself as a sort of martyr—certainly not less than a confessor—of the Protestant faith; and yet did the pope invite this Protestant confessor to send his son, prince Henry, to Rome, for the completion of his education; a proposal which, though declined, was declined with courtesy. It will also be recollected that Charles I. addressed the pope in a style

‡ Vol. iv. p. 20, English Translation.

tremendous schism; but one which (according to the views of many) it was not wholly beyond the power of charity and wisdom to repair. It is probable, indeed, that the utter hopelessness of any such attempt was well understood at Rome. But the mother and mistress of all Churches would have strangely forgotten her cunning, had she proclaimed to the world that the gates of reconciliation were shut for ever; or, had she renounced the advantage, sure to result to her from an attempt, which, she well knew, must end in a more full exposure of the disunion of her enemies. There was nothing, therefore, in the proposal to Laud which was at all contrary to her policy; and it had this signal recommendation—that, whatever might be its success, the very offer itself would probably throw suspicion and discredit on one, whom she notoriously hated as her most formidable adversary.

These considerations, we apprehend, may be sufficient to render this whole transaction quite intelligible. They may help us both to account for the offer itself, and to explain the peaceable reception given to it by the archbishop. The proposal was, certainly, not treated by him as it would be treated now. He did not repel it as an insult. He did not reject it as a visionary scheme. He calmly intimated that great changes must take place at Rome, before an Anglican prelate could become a member of her hierarchy. And there can be no question, that, when he gave this answer, he contemplated, with perfect integrity of heart, the possibility, at least, of such a coalition, as might enable a Protestant churchman to accept, without breach of conscience, the patronage of the Roman pontiff. In his reply to the Article of Impeachment, which charged him with a traitorous attempt to reconcile the two Churches, he most distinctly avows that he did both wish and labour for such a reconciliation. He declares that he ever heartily prayed for the unity of the whole Church of Christ, and for the peace of torn and divided Christendom. His desire was that England and Rome might meet together, provided their union might be accomplished without a sacrifice of truth, or an abandonment of foundations. But if this could be done, God forbid—he exclaims—but I should labour for a reconciliation. The language in which he proceeds to repel the imputation of a traitorous design against the Protestant faith, is such as might be expected to burst from a heart outraged beyond all endurance by the remorseless iniquity of his oppressors:

“ I do here make my solemn protestation in the presence of God and of

which, in the present day, would hardly be regarded as quite consistent with sincere Protestantism. Now all this leering and ogling between Rome and her revolted subjects could hardly have taken place, if reconciliation had been considered as something perfectly visionary, and beyond the pale of possibility.

this great court, that I am innocent of anything, greater or less, that is charged in this Article, or any part of it. . . . Let nothing be tendered against me but truth, and I do challenge whatsoever is between heaven and hell to come in and witness whatever is against me in this particular.”\*

But although Laud thus openly and intrepidly avowed his desire for a† reconciliation, which might concede to Rome a precedence of honour among the Christian Churches, it appears that, at last, he entertained no very sanguine hopes of success. He was apprehensive—as he declares—that “some tenets of the Roman party, on the one side, and some deep and embittered disaffection on the other,” had rendered the design impracticable. It is nevertheless most revolting to see an Archbishop of Canterbury pursued with *railing accusations* for a liberal and charitable project, which had the cordial good wishes of Grotius, and other illustrious men; and which was actually revived by another Archbishop of Canterbury‡ early in the following century.

And now—in conclusion—what shall we say of this man? Was he faithless to his country and his God? Was he without all sense of moral and religious obligation? Was he haunted solely by the furies of a malignant temper? Was he a conspirator against the fundamental laws of England? Was he either a corruptor of the national religion, or a traitor to it? Or—if none of these—was he the driveller and the dotard which he has, of late been represented? Was he, in short, the “monster or the idiot” on whom the Church, with maternal infatuation, has lavished her especial favour and affection? Is it possible to listen to such ravings as these without being saddened at the thought, that a deceiving spirit will sometimes steal even into the study of the historian?

A candid mind can surely have no difficulty in forming a just estimate of the worth of Laud. In temper he was, perhaps, untractable; in manner impetuous and repulsive; in opinion stiff, and occasionally obstinate. His very virtues were of a severe and somewhat forbidding physiognomy. Both his excellencies and his failings, however, were intimately connected with a detestation of all iniquity. He seems to have had no conception of a compromise with delinquency, whether in high places or in low. He was prepared, at all times, to *set his face, like a flint*, against every quarter from which danger was to be apprehended to the

\* Tronbles, &c. p. 162.

† Much interesting information respecting this project may be found in Nicolls’ Arminianism and Calvinism compared: a compilation which contains a vast mass of important and curious matter; thrown together, however, in such unfortunate confusion, as often to render it nearly useless and unmanageable.

‡ Wake.



interests of virtue and religion, to the service of his king, or to the honour and stability of the Church; and hence it was that he provoked the rage of the Puritans, the pride, licentiousness, and cupidity of the courtiers, and—more bitter than all—the malignity of the Scots. He abhorred and dreaded the demon which then seemed to possess the people; but he was unable to cast it out, (for it was then the hour and the power of darkness;) and accordingly the evil spirit *leaped upon him, and overcame him, and prevailed against him*. He despised the selfish arrogance of the aristocracy, and confronted it, perhaps, with something too much of the pride of churchmanship. He further was resolved that the discipline of the Church should be felt as well as spoken of, and, accordingly, he dragged the vices of the great before the spiritual judgment-seat. And thus he armed against himself *principalities and powers* of another kind: till at last the court and the faction were emulous of each other in their zeal for his destruction. He, lastly, at the command of his sovereign, made a desperate assault on the prejudices of the Scottish nation, and this at a time when all the elements within her were ripe for commotion at the very first signal. The weapon was, unhappily, launched at the flanks of a monster “teeming with arms.”\* The presiding power was instantly and implacably incensed; and, shortly after, the ministers of vengeance—voluminous and scaly reptiles—were seen rolling towards him, with erect crest and sanguinary glare, to crush and to devour him!

In the midst of the perils with which his unflinching and stern integrity had surrounded him, his spirit never seems to have quailed for an instant. For years together he heard the cry becoming deeper and deeper, but yet his eye was ever steadily fixed upon his adversaries. His name was often placarded over the town as an enemy to God and man; but there was within him a sense of duty to God and man, which kept him serene and unmoved, in the midst of the plague that walked in darkness, and the arrow that flew by noon. When the dogs of persecution were close at his heels, his fortitude remained unshaken. He presented a firm and undaunted front to the very last, and came forth to his death with the cheerful aspect of one who is conqueror, and more than conqueror. And let it be remembered, that this was not the intrepidity of a stubborn and brutal temper; for his Diary speaks in the language of human apprehension respecting the dangers that arrayed themselves against him; and it speaks, too, in the language of heavenly forgiveness respecting the malice of his adversaries. Neither was his firmness the result of a robust and hardy constitution; for feebleness and suffering had been his por-

\* *Fœta armis*, Æn. i. p. 237.

tion, even from his earliest childhood. His was a moral and religious courage, which made him strong in the midst of weakness; which gave him youth and lustiness, while bowing beneath the load of adversity and age.

To the meekness of Laud under calumny and persecution, the following noble testimony is borne by Limborch:—

“The very reverend William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, who on account of his religion was beheaded by hot zealots, here shows himself entitled to the highest admiration. Though attacked with grievous accusations, and loaded with numerous calumnies, in his most familiar letters to Vossius he gives no utterance to curses against his ferocious enemies; but, imitating the example of his Saviour, when reviled, he reviled not again; and when attacked, he threatened not, but blessed them who cursed him, and poured forth the most ardent prayers for his persecutors.”\*

Now, even if the letters to Vossius were not extant to speak for themselves, the report of Limborch would be superior to all exception; for, Arminian as he was, he was the friend and correspondent of Locke, and notoriously attached to free institutions. Here, then, we have a character, which has been spurned at as more worthy of “*unmitigated contempt than any other in our history*,” and which, yet, exhibits a most exalted pattern of magnanimity and forgiveness:—a temper so “*diabolical*” as to have been the torment of its possessor, and yet open to the most blessed influences of Christian meekness! The forgiving disposition of Cranmer, we have been told, belonged to the character of the man; it was the virtue of “*a class who are never vindictive and never grateful; whose only object is self-preservation; and who, for this, conciliate those who wrong them, just as they abandon those who serve them*.” This is the way in which resolute, hardy, unscrupulous prejudice can reason down virtues into vices. But how is malice itself to dispose of the placability of Laud? Although he forgave his enemies, he did little enough to *conciliate* them; and, as for his personal safety, he seems, all his life through, to have held it in utter disregard, when brought into competition with the demands of duty. What, then, shall we say? Was he (to put the question in the language of the calumniator)—was he “*above revenge, or below it?*”—was he a Christian, in whom religious principle was strong enough to master his just resentments?—or, was he a mean-spirited, tame, pigeon-livered wretch, who “*did lack gall to make oppression bitter?*” We leave this inquiry to the same high-minded sagacity which has endeavoured to vilify the patience and clemency of Cranmer. It may

\* Limborch's Preface to the *Præstantium ac Eruditorum Epistolæ*, quoted in Nic. Arm. and Calv. *Introd.* p. cxxxi.

be a gratifying exercise of ingenuity to reconcile courage under affliction, and long suffering under injuries, with an infernal temper, and a character that merits nothing but contempt!

Our readers would, probably, be wearied by much additional reference to the scornful estimate which has been presented to us of Laud's intellectual powers. We shall therefore content ourselves with calling in the testimony of John Hales, who, we presume, will hardly be rejected as an incompetent witness on a question of mental endowment. It is well known that some views and principles were held by that admirable scholar and Christian, tending to an undue disparagement of the authority of the Church; and that, by the archbishop's invitation, he attended at Lambeth, for the purpose of a personal conference with his Grace. From this encounter they came in, says Heylin, "high-coloured, almost panting for breath, enough to show that there had been some heats between them, not then fully cooled." And Hales afterwards confessed,

"that he found the archbishop, whom he knew before to be a nimble disputant, to be as well versed in books as in business; that he had been ferreted by him out of one hole into another, till there was none left to afford him shelter any where; that he was now resolved to be orthodox, and to declare himself a true son of the Church, both for doctrine and discipline; that to this end he had obtained leave to call himself his Grace's chaplain, because by naming his Lord and patron in his public prayers, the greater notice might be taken of the alteration."

Now we do hope that there is not quite folly or impudence enough extant in the world, to set up the flippancies of Laud's detractor against the judgment and the experience of such a man as Hales! It has, indeed, been insinuated by some, that he was enlightened rather by his Grace's patronage, than by his arguments or his abilities. It would be the most shameful of all injuries to the memory of this incomparable person, to deem a syllable *necessary* in answer to so disgraceful a calumny. The very name of Hales *the ever memorable* is sufficient for its demolition. To Laud's eternal honour, however, it ought to be mentioned that he obtained for his convert a canonry of Windsor; and it is impossible to advert to this fact, without adding, that nothing but strong importunity could overcome the reluctance of Hales to accept this preferment. He soon lost it, together with his Eton Fellowship, on the first eruption of the Civil Wars; and died afterwards in actual beggary. He survived his patron, however, many years; and when he heard of his murder, burst into tears, and ardently wished that he could preserve the archbishop's life by the sacrifice of his own.

Of the liberal and charitable spirit of the archbishop it is need-

less to speak. This is an honour which the most inveterate perversity never can tear away from him. In this particular he seems to have been emulous of that ancient and munificent piety to which we owe the venerable edifices and the noble foundations that form both the strength and the glory of this land. His vigilant and generous care for the interests of learning must, still further entitle him to the grateful admiration of his country, so long as literature shall be cherished and honoured among us. His anxiety on this subject is attested by his vast and costly contributions to the literary treasures of Oxford: it is attested, perhaps still more gloriously, by the illustrious names\* which owed their advancement to his influence or favour. Some minds there are which can find delight in searching out the lowest and the meanest of all imaginable motives for every action that may wear the semblance of virtue; and a mind of this stamp will probably experience a grovelling satisfaction in the thought, that the munificence of Laud, and his patronage of distinguished men, might be nothing more than professional ostentation—an artifice for connecting his own name with the honours of genius and of learning—an expedient for exalting the Body, “*with whose consequence his own consequence was identical.*” We can feel little but compassion for any heart, which is driven to such an imitation of the great accuser; and we are quite assured that it will find no sympathy among the wise or good. To remove Laud from his rank among the benefactors to the cause of religion and of letters, is an enterprize which far exceeds the strength of the whole corps of “drummers, who are now beating up the *march of intellect.*”†

But the dream is done. The *march of intellect* is a startling *point of war*, and awakens us from the “fierce vexation” of the visions of other times, to scenes of present and perhaps not less appalling reality. The sour and atrabilious visages of sectarians and covenanters, and the stern and angry forms of republican incendiaries are vanished from before us. The spectacle of a prostrate throne, a ruined church, and a persecuted hierarchy, is gone. The reeking scaffold of Laud, and the triumphs of the fanatical and sanguinary rabble, are withdrawn from our contemplation. We awake, and find ourselves once more in the midst of a scene that bears at least the outward aspect of peace, and stability, and unexampled grandeur. The interval of two hundred years has developed our national resources of every description to an extent which our ancestors would have regarded as absolutely chimerical. But then the process of time has like-

\* Usher, Hales, Chillingworth, Morton, Montague, Pococke, Hall, Saunderson, Sheldon, Juxton.

† We here borrow an expression from *Montesinos*.

wise brought on a portentous but silent fermentation throughout the whole mass of society. All its elements appear to be in a state of deep and restless, though not always of loud, commotion, and to be perpetually tending to new and untried combinations. Whether these symptoms promise a safe and prosperous result, or threaten a violent and ruinous explosion, no limited acquaintance with the moral chemistry of our nature can venture with perfect confidence to anticipate. *Thus* much, however, is certain,—that the agitation ought to be incessantly watched by men of the profoundest skill and the most perfect self-possession, lest by the withholding of the requisite ingredients, or by the infusion of pernicious ones, the mixture should burst into conflagration; and universal havoc should result from the ignorance or the trepidation of the manipulators.

Such is the state of things to which thoughtful minds must arouse themselves, whenever they alight from their visionary excursions among the generations that have passed away. And, undoubtedly, it is a condition pregnant with tremendous interest: so tremendous that, to an eye accustomed to the incessant contemplation of it, all former periods must shine with a “pale and ineffectual fire.” In the midst of all the “trembling of heart, and the failing of eyes, and the sorrow of mind,” which will at times come over us, while engaged in such meditations, we are not ashamed to confess that there is one point to which our hopes are constantly reverting, on which our souls are fain to rest, when “*wearied in the greatness of their way* :” and that point is no other than our National Church. We have lately had occasion to show what a salutary and conservative principle this was, in several other awful vicissitudes through which this country has passed: and we still fix upon it as the principle which, duly and faithfully applied, will, under Providence, mainly contribute to her preservation, in the midst of future changes and convulsions.

It cannot surely escape our observation that there is a spirit abroad which is ready to combine itself either with popery, or with dissent in all its manifold and whimsical varieties, with any society or any interest, in short, which may be supposed to contain within itself the seeds of discontent and disaffection. It is a spirit which is ready to become all things to all men. To the non-conformist it will become as a non-conformist—to the papist it will become as a papist—to the weak it will become as weak, and will use the language of candour and moderation—to the daring it will appear as full of strength and hardihood, and will speak openly of the things which pertain to anarchy and demolition. Its object is to banish all fear of God and all reverence

for the powers that be; but, nevertheless, it can take the form of an angel of light, and burn like a seraph, when pointing to the glories of that period which is to witness the regeneration of the human race. It is a spirit, too, which is constantly labouring to enter into the herd and to possess them, that it may drive them down the steep, where at last they must struggle and perish.

Now believing, as we solemnly do believe, that the flame which came down from heaven is burning with greater purity and brightness in the Sanctuary of our Church, than elsewhere upon earth, to what other quarter should we look for the element, which is to overcome and to purge off the baser fires now glaring round us, or to save us from the deceitful lights which are dancing before us, and alluring us to our destruction? For this reason it is, that we never cease to invoke whatever there is yet among us of constancy, of virtue, and of devotion, to watch over this sacred and celestial fire, and to guard it from pollution or extinction. We call on the friends, and the patrons, and the protectors of the Church, as they value the safety or the grandeur of their country, to see that the Sanctuary be kept from dishonour; to labour that our Zion may be an *eternal excellence*, and a *joy of many generations*. If they would pray, and travail for the prosperity of Jerusalem, that peace may be within her walls, and plenteousness within her palaces, let them remember that it is mainly *for the sake of the house of the Lord that they should seek her good*; that her chiefest glory is, that to her the nations of the world are looking up, as to the fortress, in which is deposited the ark of *the testimony of Israel*; and that when this glory shall depart from her, the abomination which maketh desolate is near at hand.

Under these impressions it is that we have returned from expatiating over those times when the altar and the throne were laid together in the dust. And feeling that an eminent portion of the Church's strength and splendour is derived from the unsullied renown of her fathers, her confessors, and her martyrs, we have laboured to rescue from foul defacement the memorial of one venerable name. In the discharge of this sacred duty, it has not been our purpose to conceal the frailties of the man, but to vindicate him from contempt and infamy, and to give him his due rank among the ancient worthies of the realm. And so long as perfect integrity and sanctity of purpose, with a heart devoted to the service of his God, his sovereign, and his country, can win, for any human being, the reverence of posterity, so long must an illustrious place, among English prelates, be, in all righteousness, assigned to Laud.

---



ART. VIII.—1. *An Historical Enquiry into the probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany. To which is prefixed, a Letter from Professor Sack, upon the Rev. H. J. Rose's Discourses on German Protestantism; translated from the German.* By E. B. Pusey, M. A. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 8vo. 1828. 7s. 6d.

2. *A Letter to the Lord Bishop of London, in reply to Mr. Pusey's Work on the Causes of Rationalism in Germany; comprising some Observations on Confessions of Faith, and their Advantages.* By the Rev. Hugh James Rose, B. D. Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, and Vicar of Horsham, Sussex. London: Rivingtons. 8vo. 1829.

WE entertain great respect both for Mr. Rose and for Mr. Pusey, and have therefore felt unwilling to interpose in a controversy which they are thoroughly capable of managing, without any help from us. But as the dispute is now drawing near to its conclusion, it is probable that neither party would feel particularly obliged to us for abstaining from all notice of its proceedings and results, and the publications on both sides have supplied us with such ample materials for coming to a decision, that we shall be able to lay the general issue before our readers almost in the words of the writers themselves.

The main object and drift of Mr. Rose's Sermons before the University of Cambridge, was to warn young students in Divinity against an excessive and unlimited confidence in the Theologians and Critics of Germany; and he established sufficient grounds for his recommendation, by showing that a large proportion of these celebrated writers had departed to a frightful extent from Scriptural Christianity. Nothing has hitherto been said or written, nor can any thing be said or written hereafter, capable of overturning this portion of Mr. Rose's discourses.

It seems indeed to us, that all necessity for further inquiry on this head is superseded by the admission of Mr. Rose's opponents. The very title of Mr. Pusey's work proclaims that Rationalism was *lately* predominant in Germany; and in the introductory letter from Professor Sack, which Mr. Pusey prefixes to his Enquiry, we have the following account of the past and present state of things in that country:

“ If then this point of view be adhered to, that all German innovations in theology discharged themselves principally in two main channels; the one in which scientific clearness and freedom were the object of honest exertion, the other in which an inward indisposition toward the

peculiar character of the Christian Religion, moulded the yet uncompleted results of historical investigation with a shallow philosophy into an unconnected revolting commixture of naturalism and popular philosophy, all the phenomena in the history of theology will be sufficiently explained. That better race of authors, for the most part too little acquainted with the principles of the science of scriptural interpretation, and the defence of religion, committed indeed many an error, but with a chastened judgment they again struck back into the right path. It was natural that they should occasionally fail at first sight to recognise the shallowness and pervertedness of enquiries of the second sort; and that to a certain degree participating in the fascination with which the spirit of that time had invested every species of tolerance, they should expose themselves to the injustice, by which their purer endeavours were subsequently confounded with those of the deistic naturalist;—an injustice frequently practised in these times in a crying manner, not by Romanists only, but by Protestants of too exclusive a system of theology. And now that this better sort of temperate, religiously disposed, and scientific enquirers have gained a better basis, rule, and method, partly through their own more enlarged acquaintance with the province of their science, (to which belongs also the acknowledgment of its limits;) partly through the exertions of decided apologists and apologetic doctrinal writers; partly, and not least, through the endeavours of a deeper philosophy; and lastly, in part through the religious stimulus caused by momentous political events; now also that studies in ecclesiastical history, alike deep in their character and pure in their point of view, have quickened the sight for discerning the essence of Christianity; our German theology is attaining a pure and scientific character, which it could not have acquired, so unfettered and in such full consciousness, without first discharging itself of those baser elements.

“Much is yet left to be done, much to clear away; but the more that genuine apologetic and hermeneutic principles, derived from the nature of belief and of thought, possess themselves of the mind, the more will those falsifying theories of accommodation, those wretched explanations of miracles, those presumptuous critical hypotheses, give place to a perspicuous view of the essence of Divine Revelation, to a living understanding of the prophetic and apostolic writings, and consequently to a purer exposition of the main doctrines of Christianity. You must not allow this hope to be obscured by what you may have seen of the struggles of supernaturalism and rationalism, or perhaps may read most obnoxiously exhibited in several of our periodical works. Within the province of proper theology this contest is not so important as it often appears, and the more it develops itself the less lasting can it be; inasmuch as an independent rationalism is irreconcilable with the very idea of Christian theology, and a bare supernaturalism, which goes no further than what its name expresses, does not contain the slightest portion of the substance and doctrines of Christianity. If then it is true, that through a genuine study of scriptural interpretation and of history, a better theology has begun to find place among us, the distracting influence which this conflict exerts, must of necessity here also be gra-

dually diminished: on the other hand, it will probably continue, possibly yet more develope itself, in the more direct province of religion, in philosophy and in politics, where amid many a struggle and many an alteration, it may systematise itself in the contrast of a religious and of an atheistic, or of a sincere and of an hypocritical character of thought, and then again from the various points of mutual contact unavoidably re-act upon theology. This danger is, however, no other than that to which the English Episcopal, nay even the Romanist, and indeed every part of the Christian Church, is exposed; and this disease, thus universal to mankind, may indeed delay, but cannot preclude the restoration of German theology, derived from the genuine sources of philological and historical investigation combined with that experience in faith, which brings the mind and heart in vivid contact with them."—*Pusey*, pp. ix—xi.

And an extract from Twestin, 'a valuable author,' often quoted by Mr. Pusey, speaks still more strongly to the same effect, and forms an appropriate conclusion to the volume:

"The mass of the Lutheran Church, the people namely, as they were but little affected by the defects of the old Theology, so have they also been by the revolutions of the new; if there have been attempts to adapt it to them, yet have not the innovations been able to penetrate either very deeply or very generally; the people has, on the whole, remained true and attached to the faith of their fathers. The religious ideas seem indeed to have lost in strength and efficacy; the habits, the whole form of domestic and public life no longer express the same uniform reference to the Christian ideas, which they formerly did: worldly-mindedness, deficiency in faith and in piety, may have gained ground; yet perhaps it is only, that what formerly lay concealed under a scrupulous adherence to forms, now displays itself more openly. Let but the evangelical faith again be energetically preached, the evangelical congregations will appear more readily than many now dare to hope. Not so much a reanimation as a new arousing of the already existing life is necessary; it is a condition like that of the chrysalis in the coverings of the pupa; the old formations have been dissolved, the anatomist sees within the larva nothing but shapeless matter; yet there do lie within it the preparations for a new organization, wherewith the being, unfolded into a higher class, goes forth from its envelopements.

"With regard to the learned and cultivated classes, at least a certain tolerance towards the faith of the Church has revived, among many, a reverence and a need of it. It has been perceived, that the way which has been hitherto trod led to no blessing; the illumination has not produced its vaunted fruits; philosophy has not justified the confidence with which it was exultingly greeted; after the foundation of positive faith had been undermined, in many, very many, the general truths of the so-called natural religion sunk in the ruins; the unsatisfactoriness of a scepticism is now felt, which conceals itself perchance under loud-sounding phrases, but deceives not the experienced, who has been tried in the struggles of life, and which deserts its adherent without consola-

tion in the presence of death. We have become convinced, that by the side of the many systems, which in part without any great expenditure of intellect and of originality, have yet found approbation or been tolerated amongst us, that of the old Church, which is inferior to no other in consistency and depth, may with honour maintain its place; whoever consequently undertakes to defend it, has at least (with the exception of a few journals and a few individuals, the representatives of an earlier period,) no longer to anticipate the common contempt and the hostility of all the self-deemed wise; and if the larger number, like the Athenians of old, (Acts xvii.) reserve the further investigation for another time, yet is there here and there another Dionysius the Areopagite among them, who finds here what he had hitherto sought in vain."—pp. 179—182.

After perusing these passages, the reader must agree with us in thinking that Mr. Rose is absolved from the necessity of saying a single word in defence of the main position in his Sermons. His opponents, whether German or British, may wrangle as long as they like about particular parts of his statement. It may or may not be true that he has exaggerated the evil which he points out; he may or may not have qualified his charges sufficiently; but their general accuracy can be questioned by no one; and his warning voice against the abuse of German Theology has not been raised in vain.

The other great division under which the answers to Mr. Rose may be arranged, is that which relates to his opinion respecting the unpropitious influence which has been exerted over the theology of Germany by the want of episcopal government, and of adequate articles of religion or confessions of faith. On this part of his subject we neither think that Mr. Rose has made out his case in the same satisfactory manner as in that which has already been considered, nor do we believe that the case can be made out with any thing like completeness or certainty. Mr. Rose cannot value Episcopal Government more highly than we do; nor shall we yield to him in our sense of the advantages which the Church of England has derived from subscription to her articles. But it is not to the inferiority of the German Church in these respects that we are disposed to attribute its *late* lapse into rationalism, but to other more extensive causes, which we may possibly advert to hereafter. In the mean time let us state the charge brought forward against Mr. Rose, and his reply:

“The causes accordingly incidentally assigned in Mr. Rose’s work (for his professed object was to give an account of the actual state of Theology, not of the causes in which that state originated), seemed partly inadequate to produce so great a revolution, partly of too negative a

character to be entitled to the name. The weight in particular ascribed to the neglect of a controlling superintendence, and of adherence to the letter of the symbolical books, appeared to confound the withdrawing of what are, at the utmost, but means of prevention, with the introduction of a positive agency. Yet the stream must be filled from some other causes than those which merely shake the floodgates by which it is restrained: nor, unless it were thus swelled beyond its usual height, could the mere opening of a free course to its tide produce so extensive and desolating an inundation. Did the removal of these checks necessarily or probably involve the downfall of the religion, which they were employed to fence in, a strong probability would exist against the truth of that religion, which was thus incapable of maintaining, unassisted, its own ground, and of producing an adequate conviction of its divine origin. The question does not here relate to the use of articles, either to restrain individual error, or as the depository of the faith of highly-gifted and enlightened men, with the standard of whose belief it may be beneficial for all to compare the results of their own conviction; but whether any relaxation of the binding force of these articles will produce not merely deviation from their doctrines within the bounds of Christianity, but the abandonment of the principles and the authority of Christianity itself. The affirmative of this question is indeed implied in the conduct and avowed principles of the Church of Rome, but it has, exteriorly to that church, received hitherto only the unwelcome support of Hobbes, and another English deist. Though fully assured of the excellence of Mr. Rose's intentions, the author could not but think, that the view supported in his work involved the abandonment of the fundamental principles of Protestantism, and derogated from the independence and the inherent power of the word of God. That Scripture did need no such adscititious means to preserve generally its healthful truths from such corruption as would neutralize their efficacy, appeared to result from the history of the early Church, in which for above two centuries no symbols were at all received, and even when heretical speculation did render such safeguards necessary in individual cases, they were extended no further than the emergency of such cases required; the rest of the body of Christian doctrine was committed to the keeping of unauthoritative tradition, expounding the word of Scripture: that a recurrence to Scripture is sufficient to regenerate the system when corrupted, independent of, or in opposition to, existing symbols, resulted from the various portions of the history of the Reformation. It must be repeated that it is not intended by the maintenance of these views to derogate from the value of articles generally, much less of such as are drawn up with so much judgment and moderation as our own; their value is certainly very great both to individuals, as presenting a test by which to examine the character of their own faith, and to the Church, as enabling it to exclude those who depart from the principles upon which itself was founded. The view, in which the author felt it impossible to participate, was not a supposed probability that the Church might suffer from individual deviations, but the supposition that the whole or the greater part of the body must *necessarily* decline, unless it were voluntarily to bind

its hands by the resolution never to deviate from the letter of the faith of its earlier state.”—Preface, pp. viii—xi.

In justice to Mr. Rose we must extract his reply to this severe charge.

“ I should have some difficulty in expressing my surprise, when I found myself accused of absurdities so very gross, as the confounding the causes of the mischief with the instruments which effected it, or the pain which I could not but feel at being charged with attributing the blessings of Christianity to the regulations which may tend to prevent weak men from rejecting them in their own persons, and wicked men from robbing others of them. I cannot, indeed, sufficiently express my deep sense of shame and degradation, when I am compelled, as a Christian, to protest against being thought to believe that man’s carelessness or man’s sin can bring to nought that purpose which God has decreed to bring to full effect. I naturally recurred to my work to see what grounds any carelessness of phrase might afford for such accusations. I found there that I had not only pointed out the withdrawing the controlling superintendence as the means only, not the cause, but had absolutely (p. 10, line 8) printed the word *means* in italics. At the same time I will freely confess, that I found two, or perhaps three sentences, on which, taken apart from the context, a well-trained critic, who was determined to prefer an accusation of such egregious folly against me, might perhaps have founded it.”—*Rose’s Reply*, pp. 36, 37.

“ When, after having stated directly and positively in page 10, that the want of control in the German Churches was the *means* by which so much evil was effected, I added in page 11, in pursuing this statement, that ‘ the evil was to be imputed entirely to the absence of all control,’ &c. I really never supposed that this or similar sentences would be taken out of connexion with the context. I might add, that if they stood in no such connexion with the context, I should not have imagined that any one who did not believe me an idiot could deduce such a meaning from them. Let me illustrate my argument by taking up Mr. Pusey’s own figure. A few months ago a new canal near my residence burst its banks after a severe flood, blew up the lock, and did extensive damage. On inquiring of a friend how the mischief had arisen, his answer was, that ‘ it was caused *entirely* by the carelessness of the attendant, who had not drawn up the flood-gates.’ Would Mr. Pusey accuse my friend of the extraordinary folly of believing that the accumulation of water had nothing to do with the matter, and that the keeping the flood-gates down was the real cause which deluged the surrounding meadows, or would he, which is still more to the purpose, attribute any impropriety of expression to him? The fact is, that some things are so plain and so undoubted, that men take them at once for granted, in common argument, spoken or written, and suppose that others do so likewise. If it were not so, it would be necessary, in asserting any proposition, to assert, at the same time, every other connected with it; and when we went the great length of expressing our belief that two and three make



five, to enter a very earnest caveat against being supposed to doubt that two and two make four."—*Rose's Reply*, pp. 38, 39.

"Mr. Pusey seems to imagine that because I have a very high value for Articles and for a control over opinion, I think that a want of them would lead to a *downfall* of Christianity. I have never said this, I have never said anything like it. I disclaim such a belief with as much sincerity as Mr. Pusey, and I claim to be recognized as holding, with as much sincerity as he does, the belief that no human neglect and no human error can *destroy* that religion against which its divine Master has promised that the gates of hell shall never prevail; or derogate from the inherent power of that Scripture which shall not pass away when the heavens and the earth pass away. But would the downfall of Christianity (even if such an evil could be contemplated) be the only evil to be feared or guarded against? We might not fear that the efforts of evil men could strike the sun from heaven, but are we, therefore, to make no efforts to clear away the 'smouldering smoke' which obscures it from our view.\* The truth is simply this, that Mr. Pusey has made a singular confusion between the preservation of the Christian Religion and the welfare of particular Christian Churches. He knows that Christianity wants no protection from man, and he therefore imagines that no such protection can be required for the good of Christian communities.

"Now I know of no promise that Christianity shall not experience very severe temporary injury—shall not receive very deep wounds—shall not be exposed, though, I admit, for a time only, to confusion and mischief to a frightful extent. I am not ashamed to avow my belief, that when mischief is afloat, from whatever causes, human care may (under God's blessing) check it, and human carelessness may give it space and opportunity to work dreadful evil. It is my belief also that there is in man such a tendency to exalt his own speculations and to deify his own reason and opinions at the expense of Scripture, that there is a need of some control over this tendency, not to protect Christianity, but to protect Christian communities from dreadful though temporary mischiefs."—*Rose's Reply*, pp. 40, 41.

Into the general question of Subscription to Articles, which is ably treated by Mr. Rose, we cannot enter at present. With the restrictions which he has now adopted, we see no cause to dissent from the opinions which he lays down and defends: but we must proceed to the newer and more inviting ground which has been entered by Mr. Pusey, and into which he is followed without hesitation by his respondent.

The ground-work of the former gentleman's volume is to be found in the prefatory letter of Professor Sack.

"But this leads further to those other charges of Mr. R.'s work, which indeed constitute by far the most important portion of its contents, the condemnatory representation of the direction which theology took for so long a period, and in part still takes, in so great a portion of the German

\* Burke's Letters on a Regicide Peace, Works, vol. viii. p. 237.

authors : and here it is my duty both candidly to avow the pain which I also feel at such numerous aberrations from the purity of Christian truth ; and yet distinctly to indicate that this evil, when contemplated in the due connexion with the free development of theological science, (and how can science exist without freedom,) appears partly to have taken place beyond the limits of the Church, partly to have been a necessary point of transition to a purer theology, partly to have been less widely extended than the author represents."—*Letter from Professor Sack*, pp. v. vi.

" Had our author possessed a vivid conception of the spirit of German theology, which toward the middle of the preceding century was more rigidly attached, than was ever the case in England, to a false system of doctrine, combined with a confined idea of inspiration, and a stiff intolerant method of demonstration, which impeded the healthy process of a scriptural and deeper theology ; had he moreover, by the study of the noblest authors of our nation in that earlier period, whether in philosophy or in practical or elegant literature, learnt the inward desire after a noble genuine freedom of mind, for which at that time Protestant and Romanist longed, he would deem the rise of a new and partly daring direction of theology, not only a natural but an interesting phenomenon ; he would have acknowledged that in part the legitimate requisitions of science in philology and history, led to the adoption of that new course ; that many also of those so-called innovators, were well conscious that they possessed a Christian and good scriptural foundation and object, but that almost all were so deficient in firm scientific principles in the execution of these views, that too much freedom and too open a course was given to the bad, the capricious, and the irreligious, to violate the sanctuaries of the Bible, by a semi-philosophical babbling and a lawless criticism."—*Letter from Professor Sack*, pp. viii. ix.

Mr. Pusey expands and confirms this reasoning in the following passages.

" Such a system could not endure ; it contained within itself the seeds of its own dissolution ; a re-action was almost the unavoidable consequence, unless some one, or some succession of men, gifted with Luther's pious and discriminating mind, should establish a separation between this accumulation of narrowing human definitions and the simple truths of the Gospel, should replace by the influential faith of the heart the barren contentious scholasticism, by which the understanding alone was occupied, or rather was distracted. It was the natural effect of a system, in itself partly untenable, and of which every untenable point was developed to its utmost extent by other deductions and hypotheses, to provoke the inconsiderate rejection of a whole, whose every part was maintained with equal decision, and as of equal importance ; it was the direct tendency of the endless disputes about abstract points, in which the different parties were agreed about nothing, but that unquestioned certainty might be arrived at, and that they were each in possession of that certainty, that distaste and doubt of the whole should be engendered ; it was the natural consequence of so vast a system of abstract doctrine, apparently influential

in the production of discord alone, that the authority of the whole should be questioned : to what purpose, it would be asked, should so vast a body of doctrine be made known to mankind, some of which in its own nature can have no influence, and the rest has none ? doubt of the whole would further be excited by the manifestly weak or distorted basis, upon which much was rested ; aversion would be created by some unscriptural doctrines, repugnant to the nature of God ; opposition by the intolerance of their supporters : there are few probably who would not have been confirmed in their difficulties by such an antagonist as Göse, who seems to have sought a triumph over, rather than the conviction of his sceptical, but probably more Christian opponent. Other causes actually coincided, but these furnished a well prepared soil for the seed of unbelief, under whatever immediate circumstances it might be planted.”—*Pusey*, pp. 49—53.

“ The final issue of this great developement is yet too incomplete, the extensive re-animation of a living Christianity too recent, the degrees in and the forms under which it has often been restored too various, to allow a stranger now to pronounce upon either the causes or the extent of that restoration, or to express any opinions upon the individuals who have been, under Providence, the means of that restoration. From the very advanced state of theological education in Germany, a vast influence is at all times in active agency, of which no conception can be formed either from its printed literature, or from a residence at a limited number of universities. By far the largest portion of German theology is a floating capital ; so that no just estimate can be made from the printed works of any theologian, of the extent or variety of his usefulness, while a great proportion will always remain, who are the instruments of a widely diffused blessing, to which their embodied theology bears not the remotest proportion : still more difficult is it for a stranger, especially for one who has only witnessed in his own country a scrupulous adherence to a received system ; to see how far much which is contrary to his own views may not only not be injurious, but, in a different state of things, even beneficial to the essentials of Christianity. Much that appears to be dangerous in a system, which has not been in all its parts deeply examined, is found in a more advanced stage to be useful or necessary : the wind, which might be fatal within a narrow channel, serves only to bear onward more prosperously in its way the vessel which has taken a freer and a bolder course.

“ Without, however, venturing to define the causes, or name the instruments of this great renovation, the gains of this long and perilous career are in part obvious ; the banishment of a reliance upon the mere letter of a received system, of a mere intellectual conception of Christianity, of a deadening formularism, of the undervaluing of Scripture in behalf of an over-refined human system, of an uncharitable polemic, which partly rivetted the attention upon mere collateral or subordinate points, partly obliterated the import of the most momentous truths ; (acting as these evils did on practical as well as scientific theology) ; and the renewed and energetic life given by the opposite of all these aberrations, are on the purely religious side an immeasurable, inestimable gain ; on

the scientific side the principles established in each theological science, and its more comprehensive and juster cultivation have been productive of yet greater benefit to theology than even the enlarged and correcter knowledge, which has resulted from the continued investigations produced by these collisions ; many theories (as those on the principles of interpretation) which were partially developed by different minds, and injurious while partial, have in their more enlarged application become favourable to the purer developement of Scriptural truth : many weak points, which before were stumbling-blocks in the reception either of Revelation or of the essentials of Christianity, have been removed or replaced : it has indeed been necessary to examine deeply the foundations of Christianity, but thereby has the rock upon which it rests, been again discovered from amid the accumulation of human theories by which it was concealed, but which yielded to the first shock of the storm or the flood : while in the well-founded confidence, which past experience has given to the German enquirer, there is a rich promise, that the already commenced blending of belief and science, without which science becomes dead, and belief is exposed to degeneracy, will be perfected beyond even the degree to which it was realised in some of the noblest instruments of the earlier Reformation. Nor is it any slight advantage (compared to its earlier state) that no investigation is now entered upon with that hesitating timidity, which contemplates the results with reference only to an existing human system, thereby producing an unconscious bias to blink the difficulties by which the wished-for conclusion is opposed, and becoming unsusceptible for that portion of truth which may exist in a scheme at variance with one's own. Controversy, whether within or without Christianity, would have been spared much of its bitterness, have been sooner ended, and produced richer and earlier results, had this candour been more uniformly exercised.

“ How soon these great results may be fully realized can be known only to Him ‘ in whose power are the times and seasons ’ of his Church. Yet, in contemplating the probability of their arrival, it must be recollected that the individuals employed in their acceleration must be weighed, not counted ; that every individual who has extricated himself from the mazes of unbelief, as many of these have done, is not only a witness to others of the living force of Christianity, but is himself so much the firmer and more energetic a minister of the faith which he has won ; that many, who themselves still stand short of a perfect Scriptural faith, are yet in various measures and degrees engaged in promoting its final renovation ; that there may be the same Christian feeling in very different forms of expression, or that the basis may exist, though the intellectual developement of it may be impeded by the intricacies of an earlier-admitted system of philosophy ; and that, in the sceptical struggle after truth, of many who are yet in doubt with regard either to the essential doctrines of Christianity, or to revelation itself, there may be often more of the Christian spirit than in an unhesitating traditionary belief. The final issue of this crisis may be impeded by a mistaken political interference, which can now only create re-action, or engender hypocrites ; or, in a lesser degree, by the distractions and irregularities

produced by the intervention of foreign religious bodies; yet it seems neither too sanguine nor presumptuous to hope that the time is not far distant when the religious energy, now widely visible in Germany, shall produce its fruits, and the Evangelical Church, strengthened by the increasing internal unanimity, fortified against error by past experience, and founded on a Scriptural faith, shall again, in religious as well as scientific depth, be at least one amongst the fairest portions of the universal Church of the Redeemer.”—*Pusey*, pp. 173—179.

These are the results of Mr. Pusey's inquiries into the causes of the late *Rationalism* which was lately predominant in Germany, and we confess our inability to perceive the connection between the different portions of his argument. That *formalism*, either in doctrine or in practice, must diminish the influence of religion, and so conduce ultimately to unbelief, may be admitted. But there is no chapter in the History of the Christian Church from which we learn that infidelity arises generally or immediately from “a stiff and formal orthodoxism.” The main stream of that infidelity which has been poured over Europe during the two last centuries, has its source in the corruptions of the Church of Rome. The Roman Catholic took his religion upon trust from his priest and his pope, and when these props were taken away, it became necessary to dig down to the very foundations of the temple, before the rock upon which it rests could be made manifest to the eye of all men. The right of inquiry and private judgment proclaimed at the Reformation, was abused by many who were far more ready to judge than to inquire, and the confidence, credulity, and carelessness of the dark ages were succeeded by a prying and sceptical curiosity, which visited all nations in their turns, and has not yet taken a final leave of any.

In Germany the peculiar habits of the people led a portion of them in the first instance to a mystical, and more recently to a critical and philological scepticism, from which there is reason to hope that they are gradually recovering; but it is idle to extenuate this unquestionable evil, and quite unnecessary to apologise for it.

Mr. Rose has argued this part of the question in a most conclusive manner.

“I do not, as I have before said, think myself competent to explain all the causes of Rationalism—but I cannot be blind to many of them. Nor can I fail to see that Mr. Pusey, in adopting the theory of the Germans, has attributed all to *one* cause, and that evidently an insufficient one. He has, in short, been dazzled by a specious theory, which has blinded him to every thing beyond itself. This theory ascribes every thing to the re-action from ‘dead and contented orthodoxism,’ and the polemical spirit arising from it; and it, therefore, rests upon an assumption totally unsupported by reason and experience, viz. that all the movements of the theological world are independent on any external causes.

It has justly been objected to Henke\* (from whom I conjecture that Mr. Pusey very much derived the notion), that it is quite unreasonable to refer every evil and mischief to orthodoxism—that it is an agent well deserving the consideration of the historian, but not capable of such mighty effects as he attributes to it. I cannot but believe that external causes had much to do with the strange scenes presented in Germany. Foreign literature, in general, and the writings of the French and English deists, in particular, produced much impression on German opinions. The extraordinary movement in all branches of literature in Germany itself, at the commencement of the last century, and not least among the philologists, communicated itself to theology. The influence of the talented but profligate and infidel court of Frederic, was most favourable to the progress of an unchristian spirit in the literary world. The peculiarities of German society and government at that time prevented men (speculative by their national character) from checking and directing their speculations, by a practical acquaintance with any of the more important affairs of business, of society, and of the state. The constitution of German universities, by making the stipend of the professors depend on the number of their pupils, unquestionably gave a sort of premium to striking speculation and brilliant novelty. Nor must we lay out of our calculations the miserable effects of desolating wars, tearing up society by the roots, and breaking up the most sacred and holy ties of life. All these things were, I am persuaded, active agents in producing the dreadful evils which afflicted Germany for so long a period in the last and present century. The phenomenon is so curious that I need not apologise for these remarks, nor for endeavouring to show, as I shall now do, that Mr. Pusey's view which attributes all to one solitary agent, or at most attributes a very slight influence to one or two of the causes I have enumerated, is narrow, unsatisfactory, and fallacious in its statements. I wish then to point out that more evil is attributed to the polemical spirit which prevailed, than on a fair consideration of the mischief of such a spirit can be justified—that the extent of that spirit is overstated—that the ignorance and negligence of the various branches of study is exaggerated, and that on these and other grounds, the argument with respect to re-action is not tenable. I shall thus show that orthodoxism is not quite the demon which Mr. Pusey makes it, and that his picture of an orthodox body of clergy, is rather like a caricature than a faithful representation. It is, indeed, a horrid picture, and I cannot but wonder that Mr. Pusey himself was not startled by it on the score of charity, when he remembered that he was describing, not a few particular offenders, but almost the whole body of the German Lutheran ministry for a period of nearly two centuries. That they were bigoted, violent, implacable, cruel, ignorant of every branch of clerical knowledge, and regardless of Scripture truth—that they were not only careless about vital Christianity, but that they ruined and destroyed it—that their distinguishing quality, in short, was a blind and bigoted adherence to the letter of their system, are statements which, in various forms, are repeatedly made.

\* By Staüdlin, in his posthumous work on Church History.



“ My reply to Mr. Pusey then is as follows. He seems to consider it as a ruled case, that there can be no Christianity where there is a polemical spirit, and that when he has established the existence of such a spirit, he has done much to destroy the character of the early Lutheran Church. Now I willingly admit all the evils of controversy. But I must add, that there are circumstances where controversies, and vehement controversies, must of necessity arise; and that it is not quite just to neglect the inquiry, whether there were such circumstances in the case before us. I am persuaded there were, and I appeal to the history of the times, in confirmation of my opinion. The variety of petty states, the different systems pursued in each, the perpetual contact of the two Protestant systems, and the vigilance of the common enemy of both, made controversies quite unavoidable. But if they be so, can Mr. Pusey justify the passing so harsh a sentence on men, who were at first driven into controversy by a sense of duty, even if circumstances fostered a stronger spirit of controversy than was absolutely necessary. I must next ask whether it is true in fact, as Mr. Pusey seems to think, that controversy and Christian piety cannot exist together? The polemic, I allow, especially the angry polemic, is no amiable character; want of charity, and bitter judgments of our adversaries, are, I confess, unlovely and unchristian. But that they who have been guilty of these faults are no Christians; that they have no perception of the beauty of Christianity, and no love for it; and that they show forth none of its spirit in their lives, are inferences which I could make without pronouncing a sentence of equal condemnation on every one whose conduct is ever inconsistent with his Christian principles, that is to say, on all mankind. When I remember that even the best and wisest men are liable to delusion; that most men are too often under its influence in all their judgments, and unconsciously swayed by party feelings; when I remember that the frailty of our poor nature often subjects even the kindest and best of us to some transport of anger and of bitterness, and that, pass by a little space, and the eye turns with the kindest look, and the hand is stretched with the sincerest kindness towards those with whom we may have been engaged in no kindly warfare, I at least cannot join in Mr. Pusey's severe judgment. Even he, on one occasion, honestly states that a bitter polemic was the author of some of the most beautiful and pious hymns in the German Church. To condemn the inconsistency thus displayed may be praiseworthy, but to deny the possibility that they who are guilty of it can be Christians, is to exclude mankind at once from the privilege of entering the pale of Christianity. I would rather feel with Horsley, that they who in the frailty of their nature, or under the excitement of circumstances, have indulged in the exercise of unkind thoughts and words, have, nevertheless, often and often, when the period of anger was past, on their bended knees offered up their earnest prayers, that whatever of carnal wrath might have mingled itself in their fierce contention, might be forgiven alike to themselves and their antagonists. Nor let it be said, that the Christianity which has not taught men to subdue their evil passions is of no avail. Let it rather be remembered, that that great work is not effected at once; and that they who, in the flower of

their age, and the heyday of their blood, may have been often but too fierce in their strife and their controversy, have, as the spirit of Christianity took a deeper hold, laid aside by degrees every evil and angry feeling."—pp. 106—112.

"I have thus far gone on general grounds only, and referred only to the common experience and judgment of mankind. But I must next allege that the theory which Mr. Pusey advances, is not at all supported by facts. His work is so brief, that he could not support that theory by any large induction of facts; and it was, therefore, the more incumbent on him to see that he was accurate in those he did adduce. But I regret to say that this is not the case. On the contrary, the very harsh judgments which he has given of the writers whom he adduces as specimens of the others, and on whom, therefore, he rests his whole case, are not justified by the authorities to which he refers. For he tells us in his preface, that he was at a distance from many books, and that he, therefore, refers to mediate authorities. I can have no possible right to judge of the extent of Mr. Pusey's acquaintance with the works of the early divines of whom he speaks. But, as I find (I believe I may say always) what he says of them, and what he quotes from them, in Schröckh, in Buddens, or in Weisman, I complain very seriously that he brings forward only the unfavourable remarks which these writers make on any author of whom they are speaking, and omits every thing which they allege in his favour; and I think that he thus makes out a case which goes very far beyond the truth."—pp. 115, 116.

These remarks are severe—but not more so, we sincerely think, than the occasion justified, and even called for. The particulars subjoined by Mr. Rose fully substantiate his opening statement, and leave him decidedly master of the field.

There are one or two other points to which we must briefly advert. The first relates to the strong resemblance which has been discovered between Mr. Pusey's pamphlet and the lectures of Professor Tholuck. In the preface to the former we find the following passage:—

"There remains in conclusion only, to acknowledge with gratitude the assistance derived from the MS. of a German friend, who has carried on the same inquiry, and whom, though the author is not permitted to name, he cannot but express his sincere sense of his kindness, as well as his thankfulness for the advantages, which through that kindness he has been, on many occasions, permitted to enjoy."—p. xiv.

Mr. Rose seems to think that the extent of Mr. Pusey's obligation to Professor Tholuck is greater than the preceding declaration would lead us to suspect.

"There is a point connected with this last observation, to which, as I must hereafter introduce Professor Tholuck's name in union with Mr. Pusey's, I am compelled to advert. About three or four months after the publication of Mr. Pusey's book, in turning over an American periodical, called the *Biblical Repository*, I discovered, to my surprise, not

only a considerable portion of the most material and remarkable facts in Mr. Pusey's work, following one another in the same order as they do there, but in some cases the very same reasonings and inferences from them. These occurred in a report of the lectures of the well-known Professor Tholuck, delivered at Berlin, translated and published with his permission. I thought it only candid to inform Mr. Pusey of the circumstance; observing that some explanation was certainly needed, if he wished to save himself from unpleasant animadversions, and that I should have great pleasure in affording him an opportunity of making an explanatory statement in the course of these pages. In reply he informed me, that, undoubtedly, the facts in question were taken from Tholuck's Lectures, the MS. of which had been lent to him, on condition of his not bringing forward the name of the author, and that it is the MS. alluded to in the close of his preface. Mr. Pusey entered into some farther explanations, but as I felt the business to be one of considerable delicacy, I requested him to let what statement he thought proper appear in his words rather than mine; and I accordingly received from him the letter which the reader will find as an appendix to this pamphlet. I felt myself obliged, as I have already said, to advert to this matter, which I should have preferred to pass over in silence; but as I am often combating opinions which are rather Mr. Tholuck's than Mr. Pusey's, I could not do so. I shall, however, quit this topic with observing, that Mr. Tholuck owes some explanation to Mr. Pusey. Mr. Pusey's work was printed in May or June, 1828, and up to that time the prohibition as to the mention of Mr. Tholuck's name was, it appears, continued; while in the preceding January, this very MS. was published in America, not in part, but altogether, and under Mr. Tholuck's express permission."—pp. 105, 106.

The Appendix contains Mr. Pusey's explanation of this affair, together with a list, and that a long one, of what "he has borrowed" from Tholuck. His statement is candid, and to us satisfactory. We conceive that the original declaration in his preface is sufficient to negative all suspicion of intentional unavowed plagiarism. It would have been better, perhaps, if the acknowledgement of assistance had been expressed in terms more expressly indicative of its extent; yet enough was certainly said to place the literary honour and the literary gratitude of Mr. Pusey above suspicion.

The second point on which we feel compelled to offer a few observations, is the practical effect of such an inquiry as that which has been instituted by Mr. Pusey. Was it a judicious exercise of learning and talent, to compose that sort of apology, which his volume unquestionably contains, for the rational divines of Germany? Mr. Rose had warned theological students against the infidelity which abounds in the works of certain critics. If his charges were erroneous, it was right that they should be disproved. If the critics are innocent, they were entitled to a vindi-

cation. Even if their unsound parts can be cut away, and the remainder turned to some useful purpose, good service might be done to the cause of religion and learning, by pointing out the method in which this separation may be effected. But to admit the evil in its fullest extent, and leave it without attempting a remedy; to deplore the unexampled prevalence of scepticism in the most distinguished of continental Protestant churches, and then employ the fruits of great erudition and labour in building up, or propping up, a fanciful theory, which is supposed to account for the origin of the evil—this is not the practical course which an English theologian ought to pursue.

But Mr. Rose has directed our attention to another peculiarity in the work of his opponent.

“I have already complained of the indefiniteness of Mr. Pusey’s language on a particular point, and I must make the same complaint of the manner in which he speaks of the state of theology at all preceding times, and of its prospects in general. When he speaks of the early German divines, we find him allowing (p. 35) that in their learning they were often superior to those of other ages; and we know, without Mr. Pusey’s information, that they held all the great truths of the Christian scheme. Yet they are unsparingly condemned. They were deficient ‘in scientific spirit, in freedom from prejudice, in comprehensive and discriminating views.’ We pass to another class. We find it allowed (pp. 132, 133) that Ernesti had got rid of the defects of the old theologians; that he had restored the true system of grammatical interpretation; and that he was ‘faithful to the sum of Christian doctrine.’ In him, however, it seems, ‘the evils of a mere external conception of Christianity were apparent;’ he was ‘destitute of the key which would have opened to him the fuller riches of Scripture.’ But at present, we are told that we may be gladdened (p. 4) by the ‘results of a purer, more active, more vivifying faith, which are now apparent;’ that there is (p. 176) ‘an already commenced blending of belief and science;’ and that we may even expect (p. 115) ‘a new era in theology, whenever the principles which it (Schleiermacher’s *Kurze Darstellung*) furnishes for the cultivation of the several theological sciences shall be acted upon.’ Is it too much to ask from Mr. Pusey to explain what this and many more expressions of the same sort may mean? What, especially, is meant by this ‘already commenced blending of belief and science?’ Does it signify any thing more than that a right belief as to essentials is now, in Mr. Pusey’s opinion, joined to a sound knowledge? If it means no more, why the severe condemnation of almost all former schools and former men? Will right belief and sound knowledge ensure a pious heart in the nineteenth more than in the seventeenth century, merely because the forms in which the belief may be expressed, and the knowledge conveyed, are more judicious in the one than the other? If it means no more, why indulge in language, which, to young men especially, must convey the idea of some vast improvement over former schemes of theology, without any corresponding reality? If it does mean more, let us

be distinctly told what is the new light broken upon us. Let us not be left to vague expectations of a new era in theology—to be formed too by the writings of one, of whose attainments and genius I may think with as much respect as Mr. Pusey, but the nature of whose belief is an enigma, which cannot be satisfactorily solved even by the Germans themselves, and who is known to English readers only by a work which Mr. Pusey himself would, I am sure, be the first to condemn.”—pp. 160—163.

It was not without regret that we encountered the above-mentioned phrases in Mr. Pusey's pamphlet. The mention of “scientific spirit,” and “freedom from prejudice,” and “blending of belief and science,” smack of a school in which Mr. Pusey ought not to enroll himself—the school, namely, of those who think themselves wiser than everybody else, while in truth they say nothing well but what has been said a hundred times before, and seldom venture into novelty without stumbling upon paradox or nonsense. The existence of such a school among us can no longer be disputed. But its progress should be strenuously and systematically opposed by every one who values the character and safety of our Establishment. One opponent, of a formidable calibre, will that school find in Mr. Rose. The contest in which he has been recently engaged has terminated in a signal victory, and the spirit in which he triumphs is worthy of a Christian hero. We trust that he will long continue the able defender of the Church, against the sceptical criticism and hazy metaphysics, the idle speculations and presumptuous novelties of the age.

---

ART. IX.—*A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Thursday, May, 14, 1829, at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy.* By the Rev. Charles Webb Le Bas, M. A., Rector of St. Paul's, Shadwell; Professor in the East India College, Hereford; and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London. Rivingtons. pp. 44.

WE are about to present our readers with Mr. Le Bas's eloquent description of the state of the poorer clergy; but we must detain them for a moment by some observations upon the *Festival* which gave occasion to his discourse. It is high time that this Festival, or whatever it may be called, should be reformed. At present it has the merit of being the most expensive and least productive charity in existence. Nothing can surpass the pomp and promise of its getting up, except the meanness of its performances. First we have Divine Service and a Collection in the Metropolitan Church; secondly, a Royal Duke; thirdly, the Lord Mayor; fourthly, the Archbishops and Bishops; fifthly, a Preacher of eminence in his profession; sixthly, a *Feast*; seventhly, sixteen

Stewards chosen from the Nobility, Gentry and Clergy, and contributing no less than fifty pounds a piece; eighthly, a large assemblage of the principal people in the country; and lastly, a Collection, which on the average of the last twenty years does not amount to a thousand pounds!!! The sum contributed by the stewards is eight hundred pounds, and with this enormous outlay the institution contrives to obtain a return which is actually greater by one-fifth than the sum expended in obtaining it. The Festival works at the trifling cost of rather more than 44 per cent. Such a state of things ought not continue another year. The nuisance is universally acknowledged, and ought to be abated. The institution should be entirely remodelled, either by uniting it formally with the Clergy Orphan Society, or by some other scheme which shall give it a local habitation, and entitle it to public support. The stewards' fines, or at least five-sixths of them, ought to go in aid of the charity; and the dinner (if a dinner there must be) should be paid for by those who eat it. The music at the Cathedral should not cost a penny. The Choirs of St. Paul's and Westminster-Abbey are able to furnish an ample treat to the lovers of Sacred Music, without the aid of mere professional singers; and it is monstrous to think of paying a *Choir* for exerting themselves in behalf of the destitute children of the clergy. When by these simple means the fund actually applicable to the purposes of the charity shall have been doubled, or tripled, or quadrupled, the appropriation of it should also be changed. At present it is employed in apprenticing out the children of clergymen, and each steward has the privilege of naming a child. There is nothing appropriate in this expenditure of the money, nor any security for a discreet and useful application of it. If the sum were employed in completing the education of the more promising children in the Clergy Orphan School, and fitting them either for Holy Orders, or for the situation of schoolmasters, it is probable that much greater interest would be felt in the success of the institution, and much greater exertions be made in its behalf.

We humbly submit these facts and suggestions to the managers of the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, and more especially to the archbishops and bishops: they do not originate in a wanton love of innovation, but in a sincere desire to do good. Most of the ancient charitable institutions connected with the Church have required and undergone extensive reforms within the last twenty years. The institution now under consideration stands in need of similar treatment, and we trust that it will submit to it without resistance or delay.

But we must proceed to Mr. Le Bas's Sermon, which, as all who are acquainted with his writings must have anticipated, is



well calculated to increase the public interest in favour of the Sons of the Clergy. Take the following samples:—

“ Surely, then, we at this day may joyfully exclaim, who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? And what is the victory which subdueth the world, but even our reliance on the victory of the Son of God? What is it but this which made evangelists, and apostles, and martyrs, to partake of the triumph of their Saviour, and to *be of good cheer*, when assailed with tribulation, and *pressed*, to all appearance, *out of measure and above strength*? What is it but this which enabled them to exult in affliction, rejoice in the midst of sorrow, to survive in the midst of death? And what is it but this which, at the present day, can sustain the followers of Christ, and more especially the ministers of the Gospel of Christ, who are placed as standard-bearers in the front of the host, and whose office it is to show that the dominion of the prince of this world is overthrown? When our Lord spake comfortable and glorious things to his apostles, *that in him they might have peace*, we cannot suppose that the blessing and the privilege was wholly confined to them. We cannot suppose that they alone were to taste the fruits, and wear the honours of his victory. Look back to the things which he had just spoken for their consolation, and you will find that they are precisely the cordials which alone can strengthen the heart of the Christian at this very day; and without which the faithful steward of God’s mysteries must often faint under his trials, and without which too the duties of his calling must sink into a drowsy and spiritless formality. The first servants and soldiers of the cross had doubtless need to have their spirits most intimately conversant with the splendours of the King of Glory. But feebleness and stumbling must likewise be the lot of their unworthy successors, if they withdraw their eyes for a moment from the same heavenly vision. The open assaults of adversity are still to be endured; the treachery of the passions is still to be watched; the craft and subtlety of the devil or man are still busy; a fearful warfare remains still to be accomplished; and nothing but disgrace and defeat can be the issue of the conflict to that servant who *will* go forth as if his own right hand could ever win him the victory, or as if any earthly honour could be compared to the honour of the triumph. No, he that would overcome must still keep the achievements of his Divine Master before his eyes. He that would stand firm in a world of tribulation, must still derive his courage and his cheer from Him that hath overcome the world.

“ And why is it that I presume to dwell upon these things, surrounded as I am by numbers, from whom it would better become me to learn them, than to urge them on the remembrance of my brethren? Why is it, but because the solemnities of this day bring forcibly to our thoughts the need and the value of the consolation here administered by our Lord! Why, but because the very labour of love which has called us together bears witness to the tribulation which still, as ever, is the lot of Christ’s ministering servants, and against which, in his strength, they are appointed to contend? Why, but because we are met to cherish and to succour the widows and the children of those who have fallen in the:

ranks of that warfare, and who, we would humbly hope, have entered into the joy of their Saviour's victory? I cannot imagine a more solemn and affecting commentary on his words, than the sight of helpless orphans, whose fathers were doomed to poverty, and to care, and to a stern conflict with the world, and this in the service of Him who came to teach them and us how to overcome the world!

"It is impossible, surely, to look or to think upon such spectacles, without feeling that the prediction which assigned tribulation to the ministers of the Gospel extends far beyond the period of the Church's obscurity and infancy, and that the incessant contemplation of a triumphant Redeemer is now as needful as ever to the support of multitudes among them who are dedicated to the service of the altar. It is impossible to behold these heirs of calamity and indigence, without perceiving, that bitter trials still await the stewards of God's mysteries, and witnesses of his truth: trials the more bitter because they often spring up out of the very sources of their choicest comforts, and their most virtuous enjoyments; the more bitter, because their sorest conflicts are often found in those very scenes, in which they have sought a refuge from solitude and heaviness, and an asylum from temptation and sin. Our Church has not dared to violate either nature or Scripture by condemning her ministers to a life of loneliness—to a gloomy and sullen conflict with the yearnings of the heart—to a melancholy struggle against those mental diseases which will too often seize upon the solitary spirit."—pp. x—xiii.

"It must, perhaps, be confessed, that if we could, for a moment, forget experience and history, we might be induced to fancy that an entire freedom from the distractions and entanglements of domestic responsibility must be essential to the perfection of the ministerial character. There is, beyond all question, something unspeakably affecting in the thought of a human being moving through this world in serene abstraction, even from its most blameless joys, and its tenderest anxieties—knowing no ties of kindred save those which bind immortal spirits to each other—pouring out all his benevolence and sympathy on the flock committed to his charge—lavishing his whole heart and soul in the haunts of want and sickness, or near the dying bed of penitence—without a thought or a care on earth, but to prepare his children in the Gospel for their inheritance in heaven! There is doubtless, in an image like this, something almost celestial. But, alas! we know too well with what turpitude and deformity this glorious vision was sullied, when the attempt was made to embody it on earth. As reasonably might we expect that angels should be sent visibly to minister unto us, as that men, so resembling the angels, should be found, from generation to generation, to supply the ministering orders of the Church. We feel compelled to throw away such hopes, as utterly fantastic and chimerical. We fear lest the sanctuary should be polluted by the approach of vice, in the garb of passionless and almost superhuman sanctity. We dread to see the consciences of men consigned to spiritual guides, who have no community of earthly feeling with their flock, and who may be wedded only to the honour or the interests of their order. We, therefore, confide the

sacred office to men, who can carry the domestic and social affections into the ministrations of religion. The same ruling powers, it is true, by whom our clergy were restored to their natural and Christian freedom, were pleased to couple that liberty, in many instances, with a dowry of indigence and humiliation. But however deeply we may deplore this wrong, we still are bound most thankfully to accept the benefit of that reform, as the gift of a wise and gracious Providence, maimed as that benefit has been by the hand of robbery and oppression. And when, with an aching heart, we look upon the poverty thus entailed on many of our brethren, it behoves us to assuage our anguish by the recollection, that they serve a Master who was himself *a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief*. It behoves us to remember that he, too, was *made perfect through sufferings*, and that he said expressly to his followers, ‘*In the world ye shall have tribulation.*’ It likewise behoves us not to forget the words of precious comfort which he added to this, saying, ‘*Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.*’”—pp. xvi—xviii.

“One word, and only one, before I close, on a part of this case, which does not always meet with the equitable consideration which it merits. With us, the clerical character is (as it ought to be) indelible. When once his hand hath touched the plough, the spiritual husbandman is forbidden to look back. His retreat into gainful and secular pursuits is utterly cut off. He cannot relapse one step towards that lower region, without scandal and infamy. The farm and the merchandize are not for him. His table may be surrounded by objects more precious to him than life, who look to him for daily protection and support; and all this while he may see the shadows of adversity thickening round his dwelling—a darkness that may indeed be felt! He may perceive, with anguish of soul, that the comforts, and even the necessities of this life, are gradually dropping away, and leaving him and his to an appalling destitution. All this he may see, and yet he must call in the aid of no worldly occupation. He must not abandon, for a time, the altar to which he has devoted himself, till the labour of his hands have supplied the wants of those who depend on him for bread. The work of study and of holy ministration must still go on; and while his heart may be almost bursting with the thought of a home crowded with images of suffering—while his spirit may be fainting at the prospect of that abandonment which awaits the partners of his trials, when his head is in the dust: still must he strive to go forth among his people with a serene brow, and with an aspect which tells of faith and resignation; and still must he speak to them of the victory which overcometh the world, and of the hope that is full of immortality! These are the offices, and these are the trials, and these are the examples, which the Christian world expects in its ministers.”—pp. xx—xxi.

---

ART. X.—*The Complete Emancipation of the Protestant Vaudois of Piedmont Advocated in a strong and unanswerable Argument, and submitted to His Grace the Duke of Wellington.* By their Countryman, Count Ferdinand Dal Pozzo, late Maître des Requêtes, and First President of the Imperial Court of Genoa. London: Rivingtons. 1829.

THE strong feeling excited in this country on behalf of the Protestant Vaudois appears, from the pamphlet before us, to be extending itself to the Continent. Its author is already advantageously known to the English reader by his work upon the Ecclesiastical Law of Germany; and the information now communicated to us increases his claim to public gratitude and attention. We must confess, however, that “the strong and unanswerable argument” is more ingenious than convincing. Count Ferdinand Dal Pozzo contends, that the transfer of Piedmont to the crown of Sardinia by the treaty of Paris in 1814, and by the treaty of Vienna in 1815, was made subject to a reservation of all the rights acquired by the inhabitants while under the dominion of France. And he grounds this claim upon a clause in the treaty of Paris, stipulating that no individual in the transferred countries shall be harassed, either in person or property, for political offences committed prior to the date of the treaty. The writer quotes “Vattel exceedingly well;” but, even with this help, he fails in his attempt to show that the allies guaranteed that *Protestant emancipation* for which he so strenuously contends. His account of the restrictions now actually existing, and the manner in which they were re-imposed by the Sardinian government, are the most valuable parts of his pamphlet.

“Servitude is not too strong a word for the restrictions and incapacities under which the Protestant Vaudois laboured. They were forced to live within the boundaries of their valleys; they could not purchase lands beyond certain limits; the number of their churches and schools was restricted; they were prohibited to have walled burial grounds; a Protestant minister could not visit a sick person, unless accompanied by a Catholic layman, nor remain by his side more than four-and-twenty hours. In the community of St. John, although the number of Protestants was very great, no Protestant church or school was allowed, nor could a Protestant clergyman pass the night there; mixed marriages were strictly forbidden; in case of any of the Vaudois going to a fair or market held beyond the valleys, they could not have there houses, shops, or rooms; however great might be, in any community, the numerical inequality of Catholics and Protestants, (and in some it was very considerable,) the number of Catholics in the corporation must exceed that of Protestants; so that it has frequently happened, that Catholics,

totally strangers to the community, have been thrust into the municipal body; and sometimes even these worthies have been of so degraded a station in life, that they have actually been clothed out of the public purse. The learned professions were closed against the Vaudois; nor could they rise to a higher grade in the army than that of non-commissioned officer.

“This description of the incapacities of the Vaudois, I believe to be correct; but should there be any error, we may infer that it is only a trifling one, first, from the letters patent of the King of Sardinia, dated the 27th February, 1816, in which after premising that it was his Majesty's intention to *soften the rigour of the measures adopted in ancient times respecting them*, the only modifications there introduced are the following: that they should be allowed to retain the possession of lands, purchased under the French domination, beyond the boundaries traced by the ancient edicts; and that they should be allowed to exercise every art or trade whatsoever, as well as the professions of surgeon, apothecary, architect, geometrician, land-surveyor, and every other for which the degree of doctor is not requisite; secondly, from the royal rescript of the 6th January, 1824, containing the express permission to establish an hospital for such poor Vaudois as might be in a state of illness; and, from the approval given to the most minute regulations relating to it, from which the least deviation on their part was strictly forbidden. It is even there said, that Article xviii. of these regulations, (with the contents of which I am unacquainted,) shall be disregarded, and considered as not written.

“It may be asked by what fatality has the restoration of the King of Sardinia been instantly followed by so dreadful a consequence as the degradation of his Protestant subjects, while no similar effect was produced by the restoration of the Bourbons to France; nor by that of the other sovereigns to countries also formerly united to France, but afterwards again dismembered? Was there any edict promulgated in Piedmont, at that time, imposing anew the same restrictions and incapacities from which the Vaudois had been delivered ever since their subjection to France? No such thing. The manner in which it happened is almost incredible. The King of Sardinia, as soon as he landed from his island, surrounded by persons of very limited capacities, was persuaded indiscriminately to abolish, by one dash of his pen, all laws promulgated under the French domination, (the taxes excepted,) and indiscriminately to put in vigour the ancient laws and statutes. The wording of this provision of the edict of the 21st of May, is as follows:—‘Without regard to any other law whatsoever, the royal constitutions of 1770, and other provisions enacted prior to the 23d June, 1800, by our royal predecessors, shall be observed.’ It was by virtue of these few words that, as if by magic, the ancient incapacities and restrictions of the Vaudois were revived, and their execution afterwards effectually enforced. This is not the place for noticing all the confusion and ill effects produced by such a sweeping enactment, which could hardly be justified after a short military occupation, and a fresh re-conquest, either by the Sardinian arms, or by a national insurrection. What is necessary to observe, with

respect to such a law, compared with the before-mentioned treaty of Paris, is, that it is but *lex sub lege graviore*; it being quite evident that, in consequence of this treaty alone, which consolidated the preceding conquest of the allied powers, and apportioned its fruits, the king was restored to his sovereignty over the Piedmontese dominions, and that, therefore, the validity of his power rested solely upon the conditions imposed by this very treaty, which really dismembered France, and prescribed new boundaries and forms to the new, (because, in fact, newly created,) states of Europe. It will be in vain to object, that the royal edict bears a date some days previous to that of the treaty itself; first, because it is clear that the force of the latter should be traced back to the moment of the occupation of the country by the Allied Powers, its object being to determine and regulate definitively the effect of occupation; secondly, because the priority of date between two conflicting laws can only prevail, when the authority and nature of the laws are the same.

“Although, therefore, the effect of the said edict of the 21st of May, with regard to the Vaudois, was much the same as if a fresh edict had subjected them *de novo* to the restrictions and incapacities under which they laboured previously to the French law, it may easily be perceived, that the impression which it made upon the public mind has obviously been infinitely less violent, less astonishing, less odious, and consequently the redress of their grievances has become infinitely more difficult. The Vaudois were not even named in the said edict; the measure was not a special one, but was cloaked, and, as it were, concealed by its generality. Finally, it assumed a certain deceitful appearance of simplicity, innocence, and almost just policy; as it appeared perfectly natural, that an ancient state, upon returning to its ancient master, should again flourish under its ancient laws.”—pp. 21—25.

ART. XI.—*Sermons, chiefly Practical.* By the Rev. Edward Bather, M. A., Archdeacon of Salop, in the Diocese of Lichfield and Coventry; and Vicar of Meole Brace, Salop. London. Hatchard and Son. 1829. Vol. II. 8vo. pp. 570. 12s.

WE have great pleasure in introducing to the notice of our readers another volume of Sermons by Archdeacon Bather. The discourses are marked by the same plainness of speech and soundness of doctrine, which characterised a former work by this useful writer. The “Advertisement” informs us that one of the Visitation Sermons inserted in the collection was published in 1823, and that the concluding Sermon, preached in behalf of the Society for Building and Enlarging Churches and Chapels, had been printed for private delivery among the congregation to whom it was addressed. The remaining Sermons are nothing more than a miscellaneous selection from the author’s ordinary parish discourses. We extract, as specimens, several passages from a Sermon “upon the Christian method of receiving injuries.”



“Injuries and provocations, though they be not a necessary *cause* of spiritual loss, too often prove the *occasion* of it. They are so, and we are overcome by them; when, instead of calling our Christian graces into exercise, they excite our natural bad tempers and corruptions. There are two points of view in which the ill treatment we receive from men may be considered. We may look upon it, either as a cross laid upon us by God's providence for the trial of our faith and obedience, or as the effect of our fellow-creature's wickedness. He whom we profess to follow, hath shown us, in his own example, how it is to be received in *both* views. Considering the evil as coming from God, we must say, ‘the cup which our Father hath given us, shall we not drink it?’ Considering it as coming from men, we must say, ‘Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.’ But if, on the contrary, injuries provoke us to fretfulness and impatience toward God, so that we forget how many outward blessings still remain to us, because one or another may be gone; or, if they excite in us a spirit of malice, or a desire of revenge towards the injurious party, so that we would have ‘an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,’ were it in our power; wishing him evil, or watching for an opportunity of repaying him in kind; then indeed we are put to the worse before our enemies, the tempter's end in stirring up their enmity is answered, and we have sustained a real damage. For the moment that these bad passions take possession of us, sin separates between us and our God. We lose the light of God's countenance, lose that joy of the Lord, those consolations of religion, that blessed assurance of hope, that calm content and satisfaction in religion which are not only so valuable in themselves, but so great helps and encouragements also to perseverance in the way of duty. We lose our relish for spiritual exercises, are unfitted for prayer and praise; (for no discontented man can praise God, and no angry man can pray to him;) and thus, in every way, we lose ground in the Christian race. The act of sin has thrown us back, and the indisposition to communion with God which it brings upon the mind, will keep us back; and then, except the Lord ‘renew a right spirit within us,’ we shall finally lose the prize of our high calling of God in Christ Jesus. For it is written, ‘If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses.’”—pp. 51—53.

“You may be certain (though sometimes it may fail of success) that persevering kindness is the best instrument that can be employed to work upon men's hearts to soften and change them; for it is God's instrument. Men are at enmity with *him*; and he says, ‘I drew them with bands of love.’ ‘Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord.’ He makes the first advances towards reconciliation; he expostulates; he does good to them that hate him; he proclaims himself before them as abundant in goodness and truth, as pardoning iniquity, transgression and sin, and thus he draws them. The love of Christ constraineth them; they cannot hold out against it; they cannot retain their enmity any longer, but must ‘live unto him that died for them.’ Many a sinner, indeed, is roused and awakened, and made *to think*, by a different process from this. But this is the way in which all are *won*,

to serve the Lord their God with a willing mind. Surely the same mind should be in us which is in Christ Jesus, and humbly should we follow him in proceeding with our brother. Different methods indeed we may employ. Force may be repelled by force; brother may go to law with brother; and these methods may, in some cases, be even necessary, and may avail so far as to vindicate our own right: but here they stop; sooner, certainly, than a Christian would wish to stop. He therefore, except where it is unavoidable, will not have recourse to them, but will try those milder means by which he may hope not only to obtain reparation for the injury sustained by himself, but to regain a brother's regards, to subdue his resentment, and convince him of the evil of it, and thus restore a wanderer to the good shepherd and bishop of his soul."—pp. 60, 61.

"Consistency of outward conduct can proceed only from stability of inward principle, especially where, as in the case before us, very strong natural propensities are to be crossed.

"It behoves us therefore to look within, and to 'keep our hearts with all diligence.' If a man 'would do good to them that hate him, and pray for them that despitefully use him and persecute him,' he hath need in general to be a '*new man*,' 'not conformed to this world' in his tempers and dispositions, in his views and maxims, but 'transformed by the renewing of his mind;' 'born again of the Spirit;' 'created in Christ Jesus unto good works.' But to be more particular.

"1. He hath need to be, in the first place, what the men of the world are not—humble-minded. That which begets, which fosters, and which fixes variance, is *pride*. The aggressor will make no concession because he is *too proud* to do so; and the injured party will make no advances towards peace, for it would be *too much condescension*; and it is the insult, the indignity of a wrong that wounds us most. Shall *we* wave *our* pretensions? Shall we not vindicate *our* right? Shall we be trampled upon and set at nought! But who are *we*? If we could but answer this question as grace could make us answer it, we should speedily be possessed of that 'wisdom which is from above; which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits.' We are indeed very *little* people. If we did but feel it, we should bear with those that are weak, with those that are injurious, and not please ourselves. We should 'look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.' We should not suffer self-importance to stand in the way of peace.

"2. Another disposition to be cultivated is brotherly-kindness; a sort of brotherly-kindness which is Christian;—a disposition to love our neighbour as ourselves, and to care most for the immortal part of him:—to love his soul. If we had abiding in our hearts an habitual concern for the souls of men, and did consider (as indeed nothing can be more evident) how much the soul's interests are endangered by the continuance of strifes and variance, we should never rest till we had brought them to an end. Nor should we be satisfied with harbouring no malice in our own bosoms; we should not be content to 'suffer sin upon our brother;' if by any condescension, any forbearance, and kind offices of ours, we could prevail with him to tear the serpent from his breast.

"3. The last disposition which I shall mention is love to God. If the prevalence of evil tempers in our brother's heart endanger his own soul, they thereby hurt God's cause; they impede the progress of the Redeemer's kingdom. A scandal, too, is brought upon religion by contentions, if those among whom they reign be professors of religion. But, on the other hand, a sheep of Christ is recovered; his kingdom is enlarged; the doctrine is adorned; the esteem of bye-standers is conciliated; they begin to see the efficacy of religious principle, and the excellence of it, if Christians, when they have suffered wrongfully, seem to be not only placable and forgiving, but returners of good for evil, and mainly anxious that a fellow-creature should not 'sin unto death.' Christians therefore *would* act thus, if they were Christians indeed, and did love the Lord their God with all their hearts.

"To this, however, I add, that we have need to be perpetually watchful over our own spirit, and jealous of our own hearts; because even if these things be in us and abound, there is still a remainder of corruption likewise, by which (if we do not watch) we may occasionally be thrown down. And we have need to pray without ceasing for the increase and establishment of these graces in our souls, because none of them are natural to us, and 'every good and perfect gift is from above.'"—pp. 62—65.

The sermons preached for the Church-building Society contain a very clear account of the recent alteration in the law respecting Briefs, and might be advantageously circulated wherever that measure is condemned or misunderstood. And the first Visitation Sermon is not only so valuable in itself, but likewise contains so faithful a description of the Archdeacon's style of preaching, that we must request attention to some of its principal statements.

"It cannot be a preaching of Christ, therefore, which passes slightly over the paramount necessity of all holy obedience; which does not urge the necessity of a 'transformation by the renewing of the mind;' which does not argue from the love of the Redeemer, in dying for the dead in sin, to the obligation upon those who thus only are made alive again to 'live henceforth unto him, and not unto themselves;' which does not insist that hereby alone do we 'know that we know him if we keep his commandments;' which does not exhort to a diligent use of those means—prayer, hearing, and the like, through which we may have *grace* to keep them: and which does not testify and declare, that God will 'reward every man according to his works' at last.

"And further, if it be necessary, as no doubt it is, to the preaching of Christ to explicate the doctrines, it is, to the same end, not less necessary to explicate the precepts: to show what it *is* to renounce the world, the devil, and the flesh: to distinguish between praying and repeating the words of prayer: to expound the *commandments*, and *that* not only that the law, by supplying the knowledge of sin, may be 'a school-master to bring men to Christ that they may be justified by faith;'—not to this end only, but to this other also, that they who *have*

believed,' and *are* justified, 'may be careful,' and may be instructed, 'to maintain good works : ' that the rule of sanctification and of duty may be understood, as well as the way of righteousness ; that a generation, prone to mistake on all sides, and prejudiced against the truth on all sides, as licentious to the full as they are self-righteous ; as ready to ' turn the grace of God into lasciviousness,' as anxious to narrow the ' exceeding broad commandment,' and as prone to ' call evil good, and good evil,' as to deny the debt they owe to grace, and dishonour the one Redeemer ; that such a generation may not merely be *told* in general terms, which neither inform nor affect any body, that they must be good men, but that they may be *taught*, with that particularity which the case absolutely requires, '*how* they ought to walk and to please God.'

" Our church does indeed affirm most truly, that good works do spring out of a true and lively faith *necessarily*. But she does not add, as a consequence, that by stating the truths to be believed we shall teach effectually the duties to be done. Mankind are neither honest enough, nor wise enough to be trusted so. And certainly it is no more a preaching of Christ to be for ever insisting on some favourite doctrines, be they as important as they may, and, whilst every thing else is superficially handled, to say this is the substance of the Gospel, than it is a preaching of him to be for ever enforcing some chief particulars of obedience, and to say this is the end and object of the Gospel. Both these ways are equally wrong, and he who adheres to either of them exclusively, is ' plucking down his own house with his hands.' There can be no surer way to make what we say on the practical part of religion useless, than to pass by the doctrines : and no surer way to preach the doctrines to no purpose, than to be invariably brief and general on practice. Nor can it ever be right to give to any main branch of divine truth always the same place, and always the prominent place in our discourses.

" But let me not be misunderstood. I have simply stated some chief things as of absolute necessity to be kept in view : and I desire to bear a testimony against all *partial* statements. But truly I mean no more. Fully to declare the Gospel, is an arduous work ; and a work, I believe, in which the wisest of us have yet much to learn. And no man, I think, ever has digested, or can digest into a summary the complete substance of that record which alone contains the whole truth of God. It may be easy enough to be, what some or other, by way of eminence and distinction, and more invidiously than wisely, choose to call either orthodox or evangelical. It may be easy enough to be accredited by a religious party ; and much too easy it may be, and *is*, at once to fall in with a system, and to adopt it upon small investigation, because much of it seems evidently scriptural, and the whole fits so well together. But whosoever shall have done this, and shall then look upon himself as a ' scribe fully instructed unto the kingdom of heaven,' he will ' account himself to have attained ' much too soon. We must search the Scriptures, every one of us for himself, and there we must look to be ' taught of God,' both what to declare, and how to argue for

it, and from it; how to enforce, and how to illustrate. As well as we can, we must 'measure the pattern,' and study the proportions of the spiritual edifice, and endeavour not only to preserve and exhibit in our teaching the several truths of God's word so as to omit none, but also to give to each that share of consideration, and that degree of prominence, which God himself has given to it; not saying most where he says least, and least where he says most. For even truth does the work of error, if it is so dwelt upon as to cast other truths into the shade. Nor must we suffer ourselves to be warped or drawn aside from this honest method by any thing. Because one doctrine or another has been abused or perverted, we must not therefore, in any degree, suppress it, but as well fully and explicitly declare it, as explain and guard it. And we must trust Almighty God to take care of his own consistency. The whole word which he has given to us, *that* we must give to them whose ministers we are. That is our duty. And therefore, when, in any particular we have done so, we are to go on to the next; and in the discussion of that, whatsoever it may be, to say what God hath said to us, and, so far as we can, in his manner of saying it; bringing every truth fairly forth, and not fearing to adopt the plain and popular language of Scripture, (always so intelligible to simple and honest minds,) because many may not see how some forms of expression, or some positive exhortations, can accord with this or that doctrine which may have been laid down before. In short, what Revelation delivers, we, as soon as we see it, must deliver also; and where that stops we must stop too; taking heed that we do not put our reasonings *from* God's word upon a level with that word itself; and remembering, that at least it is the safest way, as well as the most honourable to our Master, always to have a text of his inditing to produce, not only for our doctrine, but also for our inferences and deductions. If we proceed in these methods, it is likely enough that we may so preach as to be accused, at one time, of 'frustrating the grace of God,' and at another, of disparaging the works of obedience: and some will say, we trifle and dwell on 'beggarly elements,' and many, that we contradict ourselves. And we shall be so opposed to all extremes, and shall adhere to such a tone of moderation, as no bigots will approve. But it is no business of ours to get a distinguishing appellation, or to escape one; to have the good word of one party, or of another; or to learn from our hearers how it would best please them to be instructed. Neither warped by approbation, nor irritated by opposition, nor discouraged by harsh judgments or unkindness: our part is, to 'speak the truth in love;' and if we are enabled to do so, this is the Lord's 'word which hath gone forth out of his mouth,' and it 'shall not return unto him void.'—pp. 467—473.

"We come, therefore, to this point: we must 'first give our own selves unto the Lord.' Let this be done, and we might say with the apostle, 'Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory.' The grand conflict would then be over; and thenceforth, as Solomon speaks, 'our eyes might look right on, and our eyelids look straight before us; we should turn neither to the right hand nor to the left, but remove our

foot from evil.' Constrained by deep sense of obligation to 'love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity,' and perpetually contemplating the 'unsearchable riches' of his grace, we could not but 'put on Christ,' as the apostle expresses it, and be 'purified unto an unfeigned love of the brethren.' We could not but look with a holy interest upon every human being whom Christ died to save, and covet earnestly that every one of them should become 'a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the Master's use.'

"So that here would be both charity and zeal. And the charity would be of that sort which a minister of the Gospel needs—a charity kind, and long-suffering, not yielding easily to opposition, or contempt: and the zeal would be 'according to knowledge.' We may read in our own hearts that we are 'sent unto a rebellious house.' They are not likely, with those of old, to 'stone them that are sent unto them.' But they who are in earnest about their souls, will always find a cross among them. The 'carnal mind is,' and ever will be, 'enmity against God.' We shall always have to do with a people 'slow of heart,' careless, prejudiced. We may always look to be thwarted, and that our good shall be evil spoken of, and, perhaps, for a season, that 'the more we love the less we shall be loved.' We have need, then, to learn, that he who will be great by being useful, must first be lowly; that difficulties are calls to prayer, and not excuses for sloth; that unkindness, scorn, reproach, misconstructions, are calls to muster our Christian principles, and 'stir up the gift that is in us;' that 'the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God;' that 'the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle towards all men, patient, apt to teach, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves;' 'not overcome of evil, but overcoming evil with good.' These things, however, are the natural product of simplicity and godly sincerity in our calling, and of a supreme concern for our Master's honour. And then, I say, wisdom and discretion are hardly less so. Small casuistry may suffice an honest man: and integrity will go further than learning towards making a useful minister. It may not be easy to say, in every case, just where our conformity to the customs of the world must stop, or just how much we may mingle with it; or exactly what liberties we may allow ourselves in this or that particular. But he who lives to one end, the glory of his Redeemer, and is heartily devoted to one work, the feeding of his sheep, he will seldom greatly err after he has simply asked himself what bearing the thing proposed is likely to have upon his usefulness? He will not 'condemn himself in that which he alloweth:' and, where he doubteth, he can cheerfully abstain. It requires study, no doubt, to 'divide the word of truth;' and prudence to be advisers to the people of our charge; and 'he that winneth souls is wise.'" But the supreme love of Christ, if it be in us and abound, will both stir us up to labour and to study, and to call in all the aids of learning we can attain unto; and, at the same time, with more effect than all the learning in the world, it will direct our labours and our studies. For this we shall be 'instant in season and out of season:' for this we shall keep back, in our private expostulations,



nothing that is profitable for fear of offending ; and yet we very seldom shall offend, for we shall address every one in ‘ a spirit of meekness.’ This will fill our public discourses with whatsoever is important, and effectually exclude all that is vain or trifling. This will suggest the matter, and regulate the manner also ; will constrain us to be plain, and pertinent, and faithful, and affectionate : and, above all, this will influence our whole demeanour, so that, remembering always that we are ambassadors for Christ among sinners, we shall take good heed to be preachers *ever* ; ‘ wholesome and godly examples for the people of Christ to follow.’ ”—pp. 482—485.

---

# STATE OF THE DIOCESES IN ENGLAND AND WALES,

FROM JULY TO SEPTEMBER INCLUSIVE.

## PREFERRED.

Preferment.	County.	Preferred.	Patron.
<b>Canterbury.</b>			
Minor Canonry in Cathedral Ch. <i>and</i> Willesborough, <i>V.</i> }	Kent . .	W. H. S. Braham	D. & C. of Canterbury
<b>York.</b>			
Barmston, <i>R.</i> . . .	E. York .	J. Bower . .	Sir F. Boynton, Bart.
Brandesburton, <i>R.</i> . .	E. York .	John Dobson .	St. John's Coll. Camb.
Brompton, <i>V.</i> . . .	N. York .	Joseph Irvin .	Sir Geo. Cayley, Bart.
Kirkby-in-Ashfield, <i>R.</i>	Notts . .	Hon. John Vernon	Duke of Portland.
Sheffield, St. Mary, <i>Ch.</i>	York . .	H. Farish . .	Rev. T. Sutton.
Sowerby Bridge, <i>P. C.</i>	W. York .	C. Rogers . .	Vic. of Halifax.
St. Martin's, Coney-st. <i>V.</i>	York . .	H. A. Beckwith.	The Dean & Chapter.
St. Mary, Bishophill, }	York . .	Wm. Bulmer .	The Dean & Chapter.
2d Med. <i>R.</i> . . . }			
Ulrome, <i>P. C.</i> . . .	E. York .	Thomas Irvine .	R. of Barmston.
Vic. Chor. in Cath. Ch. <i>and</i> St. Michael-le- Belfry, <i>R. with</i> St. Wilford, <i>R.</i> . . }	York . .	Wm. Richardson	The Dean & Chapter.
Wold Newton, <i>V.</i> . .	E. York .	J. Skelton . .	Hon. M. Langley.
<b>London.</b>			
Alresford, <i>R.</i> . . .	Essex . .	Tho. Newman .	Rev. T. Newman.
Bethnal Green, St. John's, <i>C.</i> . . }	Middlesex .	H. Wm. Maddock	Brasenose Coll. Oxf.
Black Notley, <i>R.</i> . .	Essex . .	Wm. Wyvill . .	M. Wyvill, Esq.
Christchurch, <i>R.</i> . . }	Middlesex .	Wm. Stone . .	Brasenose Coll. Oxf.
Spitalfields . . . }			
Earls-Colne, <i>V.</i> . . .	Essex . .	R. Watkinson .	H. C. Carwardine, Esq.
Minor Canonry in Coll. }	Westminster	James Lupton .	Dean of Westminster.
Church of . . . }			
St. Benet, Gracech. <i>and</i> St. Leonard, Eastcheap, <i>R.</i> . . }	Middlesex .	Robert Watts .	D. & C. of St. Paul's.
St. Bride, Fleet-st. <i>V.</i> .	Middlesex .	Jos. Allen, D.D.	D. & C. of Westmin.
St. Michael & Trinity, }	Middlesex .	J. Russell, D.D. }	D. & C. of Cant. <i>and</i> D. & C. of London, <i>alt.</i>
Queenhithe, <i>R.</i> . . }			

Preferment.	County.	Preferred.	Patron.
<b>Durham.</b>			
Ingram, R. . . . .	Northumb.	James Allgood .	P. J. Selby, Esq.
<b>Winchester.</b>			
Abbotstone, R. <i>with</i> }	Hants . .	W. St.J. Mildmay }	Lady St. J. Mildmay. Vicar of Portsmouth.
Itchin Stoke, V. . }		Henry Salmon }	
Hartley Wintney, V. .		R. Brind. Hone .	
Portsmouth, C. . . .	Hants . .		
<b>Bath and Wells.</b>			
Buckland Dinham, V.	Somerset .	H. J. Williams }	Preb. of Buckland Dinham in Cath. Ch. of Wells.
Queen Charlton . . .	Somerset .	John Ireland .	T. Harris, Esq. & others
Rowbarrow, R. . . .	Somerset .	J. L. Hesse . .	Lord Bp. of Bristol.
Stoke, St. Gregory, Ch.	Somerset .	R. W. Moore .	Vicar of N. Curry.
Weston-super-Mare, R.	Somerset .	Wm. Barlow .	The Lord Bishop.
Wincanton, P. C. . . .	Somerset .	Wm. Carpendale	U. & G. Messiter, Esqrs.
<b>Bristol.</b>			
Bristol, St. Peter, R. .	Bristol . .	Hen. Crane Price	Corp. of Bristol.
West Knighton, R. }	Dorset . .	Fred. Urquhart .	D. Urquhart, Esq.
<i>with</i> Broadmayne, R. }			
<b>Chester.</b>			
Capesthorn <i>and</i> Sid- }	Chester . .	R. Heptinstall . }	D. Davenport, Esq. M.P.
dington, P. C. . . }		P. C. Law . .	Chan. of D. of Lanc.
Hawkshead, P. C. . .	Lancaster .	Wm. Ainger, D. D.	D. & C. of Chester.
Northenden, R. . . .	Chester . .	Wm. Brownlow	John Clowes, Esq.
Wilmslow, R. . . . .	Chester . .		
<b>Ely.</b>			
Great Wilbraham, V. .	Cambridge .	J. Studholme .	Mrs. Hicks.
Prebendal Stall in the }	Cambridge .	Henry Dampier	The Lord Bishop.
Cathedral Church . }		S. L. Pope . . }	E. C. & H. Walde- grave, Esqrs.
Whittlesea, St. Mary, V.	Cambridge .		
<b>Exeter.</b>			
Atherington, R. . . .	Devon . .	James Arthur . }	Rev. J. Pike, and T. Barnard, Esq.
Branscombe, V. . . .	Devon . .	Geo. Landon . .	Dn. & Ch. of Exeter.
Frithelstock, P. C. . .	Devon . .	F. L. W. Yonge	W. Johns, Esq., &c.
St. Stythians, V. . . .	Cornwall .	C. W. Woodley .	Earl of Plymouth.
Stokenham, V. . . . .	Devon . .	Henry Taylor .	The King.
Upton Helion, R. . . .	Devon . .	John Manley .	W. Wellington, Esq.
<b>Gloucester.</b>			
Ampney Crucis, V. . .	Gloucester .	E. A. Daubeny .	The King.
Compton, V. . . . .	Gloucester .	R. Jones . . . .	Rev. R. P. Jones.
Elmstone Hardwick, V.	Gloucester .	Charles Gretton .	Lord Chancellor.
Wootton-under-Edge, V.	Gloucester .	B. Rob. Perkins	Chr. Ch. Oxford.

Preferment.	County.	Preferred.	Patron.
<b>Lich. &amp; Coventry.</b>			
Aldridge, R. . . . .	Stafford . .	Henry Harding .	Sir Edw. Scott, Bart.
Alveton, V. . . . .	Stafford . .	J. P. Jones . .	Rev. W. Eddowes.
Birmingham, St. Thomas, C. . . . .	Warwick .	Wm. Marsh . .	The Lord Bishop, by consent of Rector of St. Martin's.
Monyash, P. C. . . . .	Derby . .	F. W. Sharpe . .	
St. James C. Ashted, Birmingham . . . . .	Warwick .	C. T. Wade . .	D. & C. of Lichfield.
Uttoxeter, V. . . . .	Stafford . .	C. T. Broughton .	D. & Cans. of Windsor.
Wednesbury, V. . . . .	Stafford . .	Isaac Clarkson .	The King.
<b>Lincoln.</b>			
Ashenden, C. with Dorton, C. . . . .	Bucks . .	J. Oakeley Hill .	D. & C. of Christ Ch. Oxford.
Cardington, V. . . . .	Beds . .	C. F. Bromhead .	Trin. Coll. Cambridge.
Dunton Bassett, V. . . . .	Leicester .	Wm. Roberts . .	G. Payne, Esq.
Kensworth, V. . . . .	Herts . .	E. G. A. Beckwith .	D. & C. of St. Paul's.
Marston Fleet, R. . . . .	Bucks . .	J. G. Dobree . .	Lord Visc. Dillon.
Theddlethorpe, All Saints, V. . . . .	Lincoln . .	M. R. Davys . .	Joseph Alcock.
Thrussington, V. . . . .	Leicester .	C. B. Woolley . .	Earl of Essex.
<b>Llandaff.</b>			
Llantrissant, V. . . . .	Glamorgan.	J. B. Williams .	D. & C. of Gloucester.
Llantwit Major, V. with Lisworney, R. . . . .	Glamorgan.	R. Bateman Paul .	D. & C. of Gloucester.
<b>Norwich.</b>			
Banburgh, V. . . . .	Norfolk . .	George Carter .	Dean and Chapter.
Beechamwell, R. . . . .	Norfolk . .	Henry Dugmore .	John Motteux.
Campsey Ash, R. . . . .	Suffolk . .	Joseph Parsons .	Sir C. W. Flint, Knt. and others.
Clopton, R. . . . .	Suffolk . .	G. Taylor . .	Adam Taylor, Esq.
Edgefield, R. . . . .	Norfolk . .	W. M. Marcon . .	W. Mason, Esq.
Euston, R. . . . .	Suffolk . .	J. D. Hustler . .	Duke of Grafton.
Fakenham . . . . .	Norfolk . .	J. B. Sams . .	The Duke of Grafton.
Lidgate, R. . . . .	Suffolk . .	H. W. Salmon . .	Duke of Rutland.
Long Melford, R. . . . .	Suffolk . .	Edward Cobbold .	John Cobbold, Esq.
Ringsfield, R. . . . .	Suffolk . .	Fred. Leathes . .	S. Postle, Esq.
Stanton, R. . . . .	Norfolk . .	Robert Ward . .	Corp. of Thetford.
Wheatacre Burgh, St. Peter, R. . . . .	Norfolk . .	Wm. Boycatt . .	On his own Petition.
Wickhambrook, V. . . . .	Suffolk . .	C. Borton . .	Lord Chancellor.
Wyverstone, V. . . . .	Suffolk . .	James Ware . .	Mrs. Moseley and John Moseley, Esq.

Preferment.	County.	Preferred.	Patron.
<b>Peterborough.</b>			
Crick, R. . . . .	Northampton	Thomas Speidell	St. John's Coll. Oxford
Morcott, R. . . . .	Lincoln . . .	Edw. Thorold . .	Rev. E. Thorold, Bt.
Naseby, V. . . . .	Northampton	W. Marshall . . .	Mrs. Maddock.
Pytchley, P. C. . . .	Northampton	Sam. E. Bernard	Bp. of Lich. & Covent.
<b>Rochester.</b>			
Fawkham, R. . . . .	Kent . . . .	Richard Salwey .	P. Pusey, Esq.
<b>Salisbury.</b>			
Minor Can. in Coll. } Ch. of Windsor . . }	Berks . . . .	John Gore . . .	D. & Cns. of Windsor.
Preshute, V. . . . .	Wilts . . . .	Charles Davy . .	Vic. Chor. of Salisbury
St. Peter, Marlboro', R.	Wilts . . . .	E. H. G. Williams	The Lord Bishop.
Teffont Evias, R. . . .	Wilts . . . .	Charles Rookes .	J. T. Mayne, Esq.
<b>St. David's.</b>			
Archdeaconry of Car- } marthen in Cath. } Church . . . . . }	Carmarthen	Henry T. Payne	The Lord Bishop.
<b>Worcester.</b>			
Tamworth, V. . . . .	Warwick . .	Lord Aston . . .	Earl of Plymouth.

### CHAPLAINSHIPS.

Dix, Edward, to be Domestic Chaplain to His Grace the Duke of St. Alban's.

Fitz-Clarence, Augustus, to be Dom. Chaplain in Ordinary to H. R. H. the Duke of Clarence.

Norton, W. A. to be Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Crewe.

Saunders, Augustus P., to be one of the Chaplains to the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Rev. Robert Daly, Rector of Powerscourt, county of Wicklow, to the Deanery of Cashel.

Rev. J. R. Young, to be Vicar Choral of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin.

### CHAPELRY, LECTURESHIP.

Mogridge, W. H., to be Minister of Streatham Chapel.

Nettleship, Wm. B. A., to the Lecture-

ship founded in the Parish Church of St. Andrew, Droitwich.

### SCHOOL.

Sharpe, Lancelot, to the Head Mastership of St. Saviour's Grammar School, Southwark.

## ORDAINED.

## YORK.

By the Archbishop, July 26, at the  
Palace at Bishopthorpe.

## DEACONS.

J. Sadler, B.A. St. John's College.  
B. Spurrell, B.A. St. John's College.  
R. Twells, B.A. Trinity College, Cam-  
bridge.

## BATH AND WELLS.

By the Lord Bishop, on the 14th of June.

## DEACON.

Tho. Boodle, Trinity College, Oxford.

## PRIESTS.

Henry Bond, S.C.L. Christ's College.  
John Garland Harrison, B.A. Queen's  
College.  
H. J. Williams, S.C.L. St. John's Col-  
lege, Oxford.

## CHESTER.

By the Lord Bishop, August 9, in the  
Cathedral.

## DEACONS.

George Leigh, B.A. Brasenose College,  
Oxford.

Wm. Dixon, B.A. Brasenose College,  
Oxford.

F. H. Gresswell, M.A. Brasenose Col-  
lege, Oxford.

Jonathan Blackburne, B.A. St. John's  
College, Cambridge.

Thomas Bradford, B.A. Magdalen Col-  
lege, Cambridge.

Andrew Cassels, B.A. St. John's Col-  
lege, Cambridge.

Robert Hornby, B.A. Downing Col-  
lege, Cambridge.

W. Metcalf, St. Bee's College.

Edward Shuttleworth, B.A. St. John's  
College, Cambridge.

Joseph Simpson, B.A. St. John's Col-  
lege, Cambridge.

George Cole, B.A. Corpus Christi Col-  
lege, Cambridge.

Theodore J. Cartwright, B.A. Univer-  
sity College, Cambridge.

Thomas Harrison, B.A. Trinity College,  
Dublin.

## PRIESTS.

Richard Gwyllym, M.A. Brasenose  
College, Oxford.

Wm. Dickson Blundell, M.A. Brase-  
nose College, Oxford.

Charles Lawrence, B.A. Brasenose  
College, Oxford.

John Smith Priestman, B.A. Queen's  
College, Oxford.

James Machell, B.A. Brasenose Col-  
lege, Oxford.

William Fullarton Walker, B.A. Mag-  
dalen Hall, Oxford.

John Downall, M.A. Magdalen Hall,  
Oxford.

Philip Henry Lee, B.A. Brasenose  
College, Oxford.

Jacob Picton, B.A. Queen's College,  
Cambridge.

John Todd, B.A. Caius College, Cam-  
bridge.

Ralph Watkins Fisher, B.A. Clare Hall,  
Cambridge.

Chas. James Shaw, B.A. Trinity Col-  
lege, Cambridge.

James Cooper, St. Bee's College.

Sharpe Mossop, St. Bee's College.

Benjamin William Pullen.

Joseph Gibbs, B.A.

Frederick Robert Rainer.

## CHICHESTER.

By the Lord Bishop, July 25.

## DEACONS.

James Penfold, B.A. Christ's College.

Hen. Fox Atherley, B.A. Trinity Coll.

John Pearson, B.A. Trinity College.

Rich. Waldegrave Packer, B.A. Catha-  
rine Hall.

## PRIESTS.

Alfred Lyall, B.A. Trinity College.

Henry Asted Victor, B.A. Clare Hall.

Henry Reeks, B.A. Clare Hall.

George Atwood, M.A. Pembroke Coll.

## GLOUCESTER.

By the Lord Bishop, June 23.

## DEACONS.

James Mickleburgh, B.A. Trinity Coll.

John Askew, B.A. Emmanuel College.

W. H. R. Bayley, M.A. St. John's  
College, Cambridge.

John Weybridge, B.A. St. John's Col-  
lege, Cambridge.

## PRIESTS.

Robert Peel, B.A. Trinity College,  
Cambridge.

John Chell, B.A. St. John's College,  
Cambridge.



HEREFORD.

By the Lord Bishop, September 6, in the Chapel of Winchester College.

DEACONS.

G. W. Heathcote, B.A. New College, Oxford.

W. S. Escott, B.A. New College, Oxford.

A. D. Stackpoole, B.A. New College, Oxford.

G. De Garno Hill, B.A. Trinity College, Oxford.

R. Hopkins Harrison, B.A. Trinity College, Oxford.

P. Whitcombes, B.A. Brasenose College, Oxford.

John Norgrove Baker, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Evan Pugh, B.A. Jesus College, Oxford.

George Wharton, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Richard D. Evans, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

Thomas L. Allen, B.A. Worcester College, Oxford.

W. Posthumous Powell, B.A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Thomas Harrison, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

PRIESTS.

Rev. W. Ricketts, M.A. Merton College, Oxford.

Rev. C. Bird, B.A. Jesus College, Oxford.

Rev. Thomas Parr, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Rev. H. G. More, B.A. Christ's College, Cambridge.

Rev. John Julius Hodges, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Rev. John Nathan Kinchant, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Rev. Thomas Watkins, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Francis Merewether, Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

LICHFIELD.

By the Lord Bishop, July 5, in the Cathedral.

DEACONS.

John Corser, B.A. Trinity College.

G. W. Sandford, B.A. Trinity College.

Robert Wedgwood, B.A. Trinity Coll.

John Young, M.A. Trinity College.

John Biddulph, B.A. Clare Hall.

William Kew Fletcher, M.A. Magdalen College.

Henry John Goodwin, B.A. Emmanuel College.

Nathan Hubbersty, B.A. St. John's College.

PRIESTS.

Josiah Bateman, B.A. St. John's Coll.

Thomas Burrow, B.A. St. John's Coll.

John Alexander Baxter, B.A. St. John's College.

Samuel Edward Bernard, B.A. Magdalen College.

Charles Birch, B.C.L. Trinity Hall.

Samuel Hey, B.A. Corpus Christi Coll.

Fred. William Sharp, B.A. Emmanuel College.

Wm. Staunton, B.A. Christ's College.

Hugh Wood, B.A. Trinity College.

NORWICH.

At a special Ordination, holden in the Cathedral on Sunday, July 19, John Mainwaring, B.A. of Caius College, Cambridge, was ordained Deacon.

WINCHESTER.

By the Lord Bishop, at Farnham Castle, on Sunday, July 5.

DEACONS.

William Adams, B.A. Queen's Coll. }  
By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Bristol. }

Dennis Tucker, B.A. St. Peter's Coll.

Henry Malthus, B.A. Trinity College.

Frederic Baring, B.A. Christ's College.

Augustus Smith, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Edward Young, B.A. Trinity College.

John Clark Haden, B.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

WORCESTER.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Chapel at Shartlebury Castle, July 25.

DEACONS.

John Faley, B.A. Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

Fred. Powell, B.A. Christ's College, Oxford.

Hugh Matthie, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

James Bradshaw Tyrwhitt, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

Thomas James Roche, B.A. Downing College, Cambridge.

John Piercy, S.C.L. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

William Pye, B.A. Student of Christ's College, Oxford.

John Williams, M. A. Student of Christ's College, Oxford.

William Nettleship, B.A.

John David Watson, B.A.

Samuel Hay Parker, B.A.

## DECEASED.

Preferment.	County.	Deceased.	Patron.
<b>Canterbury.</b>			
Fairfield, <i>P. C.</i> . . .	Kent . . .	Richard Kilshaw	D. & C. of Canterbury.
<b>York.</b>			
Barmston, <i>R. with</i> } Ulrome, <i>V.</i> . . . }	E. York . .	John Gilby . .	Sir F. Boynton, Bart.
Brandesburton, <i>R.</i> . .	E. York . .	John Bradshaw .	St. John's Coll. Camb.
Fledborough, <i>R.</i> . . .	Notts . . .	Robert Firmin .	Earl Manners.
Flintham, <i>V.</i> . . . .	Notts . . .	Thomas Bowman	Trin. Coll. Camb.
Huddersfield, Trin. Ch.	W. York . .	Wm. Wilkins . .	Vicar of Huddersfield.
Sowerby Bridge, <i>C.</i> . .	W. York . .	James Franks . .	Vicar of Halifax.
Vic. Chor. in Cath Ch. of	York . . . }		
Kelperthorpe, <i>V.</i> . . .	E. York . .		
Upper Poppleton, <i>C.</i> . .	W. York . .		
Weaverthorpe, <i>V.</i> . . }	E. York . . }	Richard Forrest	The Dean and Chap.
with West Lutton, <i>C.</i> }			
and St. Mary, Bishop-	York . . . }		
hill, 2d Med. <i>R.</i> . . }			
<b>London.</b>			
Feering, <i>V. and</i> } Minden, <i>V.</i> . . . }	Essex . . .	George Hayter	The Lord Bishop.
Paddington, <i>C.</i> . . . .	Middlesex .	C. Crane, D.D.	Chan. of D. of Lancast.
St. Benet, Gracechurch, } and St. Leonard, } East Cheap, <i>R. and</i> } Stoke Newington, <i>R.</i> }	Middlesex .	G. Gaskin, D.D.	The Lord Bishop.
			D & C. of Canterbury
			and D. & C. of St.
			Paul's, <i>alt.</i>
			Preb. of Newington in
			Cath. Ch. of St. Paul's.
<b>Winchester.</b>			
Ashe, <i>R.</i> . . . . .	Hants . . .	Benj. Lefroy . .	Trustees of late J. H.
			Lefroy.
Pamber, <i>C. and</i> } Sherburne, <i>V.</i> . . }	Hants . . .	H. Hall, D.D. . .	Queen's Coll. Oxford.
Somborne, Kings, <i>V.</i> }			
Little, <i>C.</i> . . . . }	Hants . . .	R. Taylor . . .	Sir C. Mill, Bart.
and Stockbridge, <i>C.</i> }			
<b>Bath and Wells.</b>			
Weston super Mare, <i>R.</i>	Somerset . .	Fra. Blackburne	The Lord Bishop.

Preferment.	County.	Deceased.	Patron.
<b>Ely.</b>			
Prebend. in the Cath. Ch. Westley Waterless, R. .	Cambridge Cambridge	G. Gaskin, D.D. R. Hopton Smith	The Lord Bishop.
<b>Exeter.</b>			
Ashreigny, R. and Wenilworthy, R. . }	Devon . .	J. T. Johnson .	Rev. J. T. Johnson.
Ashwater, R. . . .	Devon . .	Thomas Melhuish	Rev. T. Melhuish.
Atherington, R. . .	Devon . .	George Burgess .	Francis Bassett, Esq.
Holbeton, R. . . .	Exeter . .	Thomas Mends .	The King.
Stokenham . . . .	Devon . .	Cha. Holdsworth	The King.
<b>Gloucester.</b>			
Elmstone, Hardwick, } V. and Treddington, }	Gloucester .	H. Bond Fowler }	Lord Chancellor. The Lord Bishop.
Ch. . . . .			
Woolstone, R. . . .	Gloucester .	Edw. Southouse	Earl of Coventry.
<b>Hereford.</b>			
Upton Cresset, R. } (And Dom. Chap. to H. R. H. the D. of Cumberland, and Chap. to the City of London Lying-in- Hosp.) . . . . }	Salop . .	W. Towne, D.D.	Miss Cresset.
<b>Lich. &amp; Coventry.</b>			
Alveton, V. . . . .	Staffordshire	Thomas Blackley	Rev. W. Eddowes.
Threckingham, V. . .	Lincoln . .	D. H. Urquhart	Sir G. Heathcote, Bt.
Uttoxeter, R. . . .	Staffordshire	H. Bond Fowler	D. & Can. of Windsor.
<b>Lincoln.</b>			
Arlesey, V. . . . .	Bedfordshire	R. R. Houston .	R. Houston, Esq.
Barkston, R. . . . .	Lincoln . .	R. Kilshaw . }	Preb. of North Gran- tham in Sarum Cath.
Norton-by-Twycross, } R. and Thrussing- ton, V. (Also Dom. Chap. to Duke of Marlborough) . . }	Leicester .	William Casson }	Lord Chancellor. Earl of Essex.
Winterton, V. . . . .	Lincoln . .	T. W. Northmore	Lord Chancellor.
<b>Landaff.</b>			
St. Bride's, R. . . .	Monmouth	John Drake . .	T. Matthews, Esq.

Preferment.	County.	Deceased.	Patron.
<b>Norwich.</b>			
Barmer, C. and Houghton-in-the- Hole, V. and Twy- ford, R. . . . .	Norfolk . .	S. Henry Savory	T. Kerslake, Esq. Mar. Cholmondeley. George Thomas, &c.
Chattisham, V. and Creting, R. . . .	Suffolk . .	B. G. Heath . .	Eton College.
Clopton, R. and Oulton, R. . . . .	Suffolk . .	J. G. Spurgeon	J. Spurgeon, Esq. Rev. G. Anguish.
Denston, P. C. and Wickhambrook, V. }	Suffolk . .	Tho. Seabrook	General Robinson. Lord Chancellor.
Edgefield, R. and Long Melford, R. }	Norfolk . }	Bransby Francis	J. Marcon, Esq. Ex. of Rev. J. Leero.
Hackford, R. . . .	Suffolk . }	William Sewell .	G. H. Holley, Esq.
Melton Parva, V. and Preston St. Mary, V. }	Norfolk . }	J. Dunn . . . .	Emman. Coll. Camb.
Ringsfield, R. . . .	Suffolk . .	Guntle Postle . .	Samuel Postle, Esq.
Saxham, Great, R. .	Suffolk . .	J. Lowe . . . .	Robert Muir, Esq.
Wyverstone, V. . .	Suffolk . .	Orbell Ray . . }	Mrs. Moseley and John Moseley, Esq.
<b>Salisbury.</b>			
Alton Barnes, R. . .	Wilts . . .	A. W. Hare . . }	Warden and Fellows of New Coll. Oxford.
North Tidworth . .	Wilts . . .	John Hughes . .	Lord Chancellor.
<b>St. David's.</b>			
Llanyl, V. . . . .	Cardigan .	David Felix . .	The Lord Bishop.
<b>Worcester.</b>			
Astley, R. . . . .	Worcester .	J. J. D. Cookes	Rev. J. J. D. Cookes.

Name.	Residence.	County.
Anderson, Charles . . . . .	Closburn . . . . .	Scotland.
Carter, Wilfred, D. D. . . .	Chapl. to Marq. of Queensbury.	
Chichester, George Augustus	Northlands . . . . .	Sussex.
Evans, John . . . . .	Chaplain of H. M. Ship <i>Java</i> , Madras Roads.	
Jee, Joseph, B. D. . . . .	Fellow of Queen's College . . . . .	Cambridge.
Langton, Algernon . . . . .	Reader of the Roll's Chapel.	
Mackereth, M. . . . .	Mast. of the Gram. School, Thornton, Yorkshire.	
Magan, Henry . . . . .	Rutland Square . . . . .	Dublin.
Roberts, Thomas . . . . .	Head Mast. of the Free Gram. School, Chelmsford.	
Roope, John . . . . .	Adam Street, Adelphi . . . . .	Middlesex.
Sawrin, J. . . . .		Dublin.
Ward, Joseph . . . . .	Newport Pagnell . . . . .	Bucks.
Williams, Thomas . . . . .	Preston Candover . . . . .	Hants.
Williams, J. . . . .	Mast. of Gram. School, Leominster. .	Hereford.

*MARRIED.*

Bathurst, W. H., Rector of Barwick on Elmet, to Mary Anne, youngest daughter of the late M. Rhodes, Esq., of Leeds.

Baylie, John, Perpetual Curate of Bloxwich, to Catharine, daughter of Wm. Neville, Esq. of Metehley Abbey, Staffordshire.

Benson, S., *M.A.*, of St. Saviour's, to Miss H. M. Waller, of Peckham.

Blyth, Edward Gwyn, Rector of Burnham Deepdale, Norfolk, and Chaplain of Holkham, to Mary, eldest daughter of the late Thomas Kerslake, of Banner, in the same county.

Booker, Luke, *LL.D. F.R.S.L.*, &c. Vicar of Dudley, to Elizabeth, youngest daughter of the late Dr. Barclay, of Conduit Street, London.

Brickenden, F. W., *B.D.*, Vice-Provost of Worcester College, Oxford, Rector of Higgeston, Bucks, and Vicar of Dewsall, Herefordshire, to Anne, youngest daughter of the late Miles Coyle, Esq.

Brine, C. B., Rector of St. James's, Southelmham, Suffolk, to Margaret Augusta, eldest daughter of the late Major-General Robert Kelso.

Bromfield, Henry, *B.A.*, of Wadham College, Oxford, son of the Rev. T. R. Bromfield, Prebendary of Lichfield, to Sarah, eldest daughter of the late H. Hickman, Esq., of Newnham.

Burton, Lingen, *M.A.*, Vicar of Holy Cross and St. Giles's, Salop, to Everilda, second daughter of the late Rev. R. Rigbye, of Harrock Hall, Lancashire.

Chatfield, R. M., *B.A.*, of Trinity College, Cambridge, to Anna Maria, third daughter of Thomas Jesson, Esq., of Hill-park, Kent.

Chilcott, William Francis, of Monksilver, to Miss Frances Wilson Leigh, eldest daughter of Mr. W. Leigh, of Bardon.

Cornish, Sidney William, *M.A.*, late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and Master of the King's School of St. Mary Ottery, to Jane, eldest daughter of Samuel Kingdon, Esq.

Cragg, S., *M.A.*, of Great Ilford, Essex, to Catharine Crewe, second daughter of Sir F. Cotgreave, Bart., of Netherleigh House, near Chester.

Cremer, C., Rector of Felbrigg and Meton, to Marianne, eldest daughter of the late George Wyndham, Esq., of Cromer Hall, Norfolk.

Currie, Thomas, of the precincts of Norwich, to Maria Elizabeth, second daughter of Robert Wall, Esq., of Yarmouth.

Dawson, G. F., *B.A.*, Minister of St. James, Guernsey, to Anna Maria Hennen, eldest daughter of the late Dr. Hennen, Inspector of Military Hospitals.

Dickinson, J., Vicar of Compton Dundon, to Frances Elizabeth, second daughter of the late Rev. T. A. Salmon, Prebend of Wells.

Dodson, Nathaniel, *M.A.*, of St. John's College, Oxford, Prebendary of Lincoln and Vicar of Abingdon, to Mary Anne, eldest daughter of the Rev. Charles Wapshare.

Edridge, Charles C., eldest son of the late Rev. Dr. Edridge, to Caroline Elizabeth Manners, only daughter of the Rev. R. Lockwood, Prebendary of Peterborough and Vicar of Lowestoft.

Egremont, Godfrey George, Vicar of Barrow, Lincolnshire, to Emily, youngest daughter of the late John Barkworth, Esq., of Hull.

Fry, John, Rector of Desford, Leicestershire, to Ursula Dorothy, only child of the late John Perry, Esq., of Hereford.

Gane, William, *B.C.L.*, of Milborne Port, to Mary, eldest daughter of the Rev. George Wood, Rector of the Holy Trinity, Dorchester.

Geldart, James William, *LL.D.*, Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Cambridge, to Mary Jane, third daughter of Richard Wardroper, Esq.

Gibson, J. C., *M.A.*, Rector of Bermondsey, London, to Eleanor, daughter of Thomas Gartsell, Esq., of that place.

Gibson, N. W., *M.A.*, Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge, to Mrs. Hodgkinson, daughter of William Simmons, Esq.

Gough, Henzell, to Miss Durban, of Upper Church Street, Bath.

Griffith, Charles, *M.A.*, of Llwyndwis, Cardiganshire, to Mary, youngest daughter of C. Marshall, Esq., of Steyning, Sussex.

Hanbury, A., Vicar of Bures, St. Mary, Suffolk, to Jessie, only daughter of the late Rev. Archibald Scott, of Pitmain, Lanarkshire.

Harris, James Lampen, *M.A.*, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and Perpetual Curate of Plymstock, to Sophia Elizabeth, relict of the late Lieut. Colonel Henry Browne, of the 87th regiment.

Harris, T. K. W., Rector of St. Thomas, Haverfordwest, to Maria Thomasia, younger daughter of M. Reynolds, Esq., *M.D.*

Hutchins, A. B., of Weyhill, to Miss J. Frances Bourdillon.

Jones, Thomas, Rector of Hempstead, third son of Mr. Alderman Jones, of Gloucester, to Mary, second daughter of the late James Maddox, Esq., of Monmouth.

Kelly, George, Vicar of Aldborough, to Albina, fourth daughter of John Dalton, Esq., of Slemingforth Hall, Yorkshire.

Knyvell, Charles Wm., Student of Christ Church, Oxford, and of Mitcham, Surrey, to Julia, second daughter of the Rev. J. B. Ferrers, Rector of Beddington.

Kynaston, John, *M.A.*, Head Master of the Free Grammar School, Drayton, Salop, to Elizabeth, second daughter of the Rev. W. Muckley, of Wakefield, Yorkshire.

Lowndes, M., Vicar of Buckfastleigh, to Sophia Elizabeth Templar, eldest daughter of Captain T. White, R.N. of Buckfastleigh Abbey.

Luxmoore, Charles Scott, Dean of St. Asaph, to Catharine, youngest daughter of the Right Hon. Sir John Nicholl.

Molesworth, William, *M.A.*, second son of Sir William Molesworth, Bart., of Pen-carrow, and Rector of St. Breske and St. Erwan, Cornwall, to Frances Susanna, third daughter of the late James Buller, Esq., of Downes, Devon.

Nelson, John, Rector of St. John's, Fulham, to Susannah Cooper, only child of the late Rev. W. Peat.

Pope, Alfred, of Leamington, Warwickshire, to Anna Maria, daughter of the late J. Crosby, Esq., of Westbury, Wilts.

Sankey, Richard, *M.A.*, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to Mary Thomason, eldest daughter of the Rev. Richard Boys, *M.A.*, senior Chaplain to the Hon. East India Company at St. Helena.

Sim, Henry, *M.A.*, of Bonsall, Derbyshire, to Mrs. Harriet Dod, of Matlock.

Thickens, William, to Anne, only daughter of the late Samuel Brooks, Esq., of Wolvershill Hall, Warwickshire.

Thorold, Henry Baugh, *B.A.*, of Trinity College, Oxford, to Julia, youngest daughter of John Thomas Ellis, Esq., late of Widdiall Hall, Herts.

Turner, Charles, *M.A.*, of Magdalen College, Cambridge, and Curate of Lambeth, Surrey, to Katharine Anne, second daughter of George Cathrow, Esq., of Hoddesdon, Herts.

Walker, Thomas, *M.A.*, Prebendary of the Collegiate Church, Wolverhampton, to Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Richard Fryer, Esq., of the Wergs, Staffordshire.

Williams, Charles Keven, *M.A.*, Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Master of the Grammar School at Lewes, to Amelia, only child of J. Lampeer, Esq., Paymaster of the South Devon Militia.

Williams, Henry Bayley, *B.A.*, of Jesus College, Oxford, son of the Rev. P. B. Williams, *M.A.*, Rector of Laurrey and Lauberris, Carnarvon, to Mary Anne, only child of the Rev. John Davids, *M.A.*, of Aldridge, Staffordshire.

Wolseley, Sir Richard, Bart., to Miss Smith, of Dublin.



# PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITIES.

## OXFORD.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM JULY TO SEPTEMBER INCLUSIVE.

### DOCTORS IN DIVINITY.

*June 26.*

Rev. Edward Burton, late Student of Christ's College, Regius Professor of Divinity.

Rev. Edwin Jacob, late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Vice-President of King's College, New Brunswick.

### HONORARY DOCTORS IN CIVIL LAW.

*July 1, (the *Encenia*.)*

His Excellency James Barbour, Esq. of Barbourville, in Virginia, Envoy of the United States of America.

His Excellency Sir Howard Douglas, Bart. F.R.S. Knight Companion of the Bath, and also of the Order of Charles of Spain, Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Province of New Brunswick.

Sir John Eardley Eardley-Wilmot, Bart. of Berkswell Hall, in the county of Warwick, F.R.S. F.S.A. F.L.S.

Sir William Edward Parry, Knight, F.R.S. Captain in the Royal Navy.

Sir John Franklin, Knight, F.R.S. Captain in the Royal Navy.

### DOCTOR IN CIVIL LAW.

*July 11.*

Wm. Robinson, Esq. Balliol College.

### DOCTOR IN MEDICINE.

*July 2.*

Thomas Davidson, Worcester College.

### BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

*June 25.*

Rev. Edwin Jacob, late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Vice-President of King's College, New Brunswick.

### BACHELOR IN MEDICINE, (with *Licence to practice*.)

*June 25.*

Thomas Davidson, Worcester College.

### MASTERS OF ARTS.

*June 25.*

David Vavasour Durell, Christ's College, Grand Compounder.

Rev. David Smith Stone, Exeter College, Grand Compounder.

John Aldridge, Christ's College.

William Hodgson, Queen's College.

Rev. Thomas Nixon, Lincoln College.

Rev. John Alexander Gower, Chaplain of Magdalen College.

Henry Edm. Freyer, Pembroke Coll.

Peter Stafford Carey, St. John's Coll.

Rev. William D. Johnston, St. John's College.

Rev. Proby John Ferrers, Oriel Coll.

Rev. Robert Kilvert, Oriel College.

*July 2.*

Rev. William Hale, Magdalen Hall.

Digby Caley Wrangham, Brasenose College, Grand Compounder.

Rev. James Nelson Palmer, St. John's College, Grand Compounder.

Rev. James Hutchinson, St. John's College.

Rev. Wm. S. Hadley, Queen's College.

Rev. Rob. Wickham, Christ's College.

Charles Waring Faber, Scholar of University College, and Vinerian Scholar.

William Hind, University College.

Seth Burge Plummer, University Coll.

Edward Simms, Wadham College.

Geo. Thomas Robertson, Lincoln Coll.

William Sewell, Fellow of Exeter Coll.

Rev. Augustus James Brine, Exeter College.

John Clutton, Worcester College.

Rev. Jas. Legrew Hesse, Trinity Coll.

William Robinson, Balliol College.

Rev. John Baines Graham, M.A. late Fellow of Queen's College, and Rev. C. Lawson, M.A. St. John's College, Cambridge, were admitted *ad eundem*.

*July 11.*

Edward Powlett Blunt, Scholar of Corpus Christi College.

John Earle Pitcher, Oriel College.

Charles Dacres Bevan, Balliol College.

## BACHELORS OF ARTS.

June 25.

Wm. Gray, Magdalen College, Grand Compounder.

Charles Sergeaut, Brasenose College, Grand Compounder.

Henry W. Wiseman, Balliol College, Grand Compounder.

Alexander Murray, Magdalen Hall.

John Proctor, Brasenose College.

Walter Cecil Davies, Jesus College.

John Henry Barker, Christ's College.

Richard W. P. Davies, Worcester Coll.

Thomas Streatfield Lightfoot, Exeter College.

Henry Hugh Way, Postmaster of Merton College.

Edward C. Brown, Postmaster of Merton College.

John Holt Ensell, Queen's College.

Hargood B. Snooke, Pembroke Coll.

William Nicholson, Trinity College.

June 26.

John Seeley, Exeter College.

July 2.

John Hockley Taylor, Queen's College.

Wm. Abbott, Scholar of Queen's Coll.

Cha. Viscount Marsham, Christ's Coll.

Hon. Robert Liddell, Christ's College.

Simeon James Etty, New College.

H. D. Harrington, Fellow of Exeter College.

B. W. Newton, Fellow of Exeter Coll.

W. J. Copeland, Scholar of Trinity College.

Charles John Bond, Trinity College.

Tho. Henry Paddon, Trinity College.

July 11.

G. H. S. Johnson, Scholar of Queen's College.

John Capel H. Tracy, Oriel College.

---

MISCELLANEOUS UNIVERSITY  
INTELLIGENCE.

June 25.

The Rev. Henry Allison Dodd, M.A., the Rev. Thomas Pearson, M.A., and the Rev. Rob. Coulthard, M.A. were elected Fellows of Queen's College, on the Old Foundation; G. H. S. Johnson, J. Richardson, and W. Abbot, Taberdars; and J. Hetherington, Thomas Dand, Thomas Calvert, Henry Hebson, Lawson Peter Dykes, Edward Fawcett, Joseph Dodd,

and Thomas Bowser Harrison Thompson, Scholars of the same Society.

June 29.

Messrs. Jas. Guillemard, John Carter, and Thomas Chandler Curteis, were admitted Fellows of St. John's College; Mr. James Parker Deane was elected Founder's Kin Fellow; and Messrs. John S. Pinketon, Edw. William Vaughan, John Joseph Pratt, and Francis John Kitson, were elected Scholars of the said Society.

June 30.

Mr. Cha. Cheyne, Commoner of Pembroke College, was elected Scholar of Lincoln College.

William Jacobson, Esq. B.A. of Lincoln College, St. Vincent Love Hammick, Esq. B.A. of Exeter College, and Richard Croft, Esq. B.A. Scholar of Balliol College, were elected Fellows of Exeter College.

Mr. M. H. G. Buckle, B.A. was elected a Probationer Fellow; and Mr. Charles Browne Dalton of the county of Essex, a Scholar of Wadham College.

July 2.

The Marquess of Abercorn, and the Marquess of Douglas and Clydesdale, eldest son of the Duke of Hamilton, were admitted Noblemen of Christ's College.

July 11.

The Rev. William Kay, M.A. Fellow of Lincoln College, was nominated a Public Examiner in *Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis*.

July 27.

The Rev. Jas. Russell Phillpott, M.A. Somersetshire; Rev. George Wells, M.A. Diocese of Chichester; and James Henry Hughes, B.A. Wiltshire, were admitted Probationer Fellows of Magdalen College.

Edw. Green and Henry Cope Onslow, Diocese of Chichester; Thomas Harris, Warwickshire; George Ayscough Chaplin, and John Montague Cholmeley, Lincolnshire, were admitted Demies of the same College.

August 3.

At the Visitation of Abingdon School, the following gentlemen were elected to Scholarships at Pembroke College:—*Tesdale Foundation*—Mr. H. Percival Skelton, Mr. Martin Hawkins (Founder's Kin), Mr. Badcock, Mr. Tho. Goodlake. *Wightwick Foundation*—Mr. Strange.

An election to the Scholarship founded in Pembroke College, by Sir John Phillips, Bart. for natives of the county of Pembroke, will take place on Wednesday, the 21st of October next, in Pembroke College. Candidates must be between the age of fourteen and twenty, and are required to produce, at the time of election, an authentic copy of the register of the parish, signed by the parson, churchwardens, and overseers of such parish for the time being, where they were respectively born, within the said county.

Persons intending to offer themselves as Candidates must notify the same to the Master of the College *ten* days previously to the day of election.

## PRIZES.

### CHANCELLOR'S PRIZES.

Subjects for the ensuing year :—

For Latin Verse—" *Tyrus.*"

For an English Essay—" *The Character of Socrates, as described by his disciples Xenophon and Plato under the different points of view in which it is contemplated by each of them.*"

For a Latin Essay—" *Utrum apud Græcos an apud Romanos magis exculta fuerit civilis Scientia.*"

The first of the above subjects is intended for those gentlemen who, on the day appointed for sending the exercises to the Registrar of the University, shall not have exceeded four years, and the other two for such as shall have exceeded four, but not completed seven years, from the time of their matriculation.

### SIR ROGER NEWDIGATE'S PRIZE.

For the best composition in English verse, not limited to fifty lines, by any Undergraduate who, on the day above specified, shall not have exceeded four years from the time of his matriculation.

Subject :—" *The African Desert.*"

In every case the time is to be computed by calendar, not academical years, and strictly, from the day of matriculation to the day on which the exercises are to be delivered to the Registrar of the University, without reference to any intervening circumstances whatever.

No person who has already obtained a prize will be deemed entitled to a second prize of the same description.

The exercises are all to be sent under a sealed cover to the Registrar of the University on or before the first day of May next. None will be received after that time. The author is required to conceal his name, and to distinguish his composition by what motto he pleases; sending at the same time his name, and the date of his matriculation, sealed up under another cover, with the motto inscribed upon it.

The exercises to which the prizes shall have been adjudged will be repeated (after a previous rehearsal) in the Theatre, upon the Commemoration Day, immediately after the Creweian oration.

### THEOLOGICAL PRIZE.

Instituted June 2, 1825.

Subject :—" *Whether the doctrine of One God, differing in his nature from all other beings, was held by any Heathen nation or sect of philosophers, before the birth of Christ.*"

The above subject, for an English Essay, appointed by the judges, is proposed to members of the University on the following conditions :—

I. The candidate must have passed his examination for the degrees of B.A. or B.C.L.

II. He must not on this day (June 26) have exceeded his twenty-eighth Term.

III. He must have commenced his sixteenth Term eight weeks previous to the day appointed for sending in his Essay to the Registrar of the University.

In every case the Terms are to be computed from the matriculation inclusively.

The Essays are to be sent under a sealed cover to the Registrar of the University on or before the Wednesday in Easter week next ensuing. None will be received after that day.

The candidate is desired to conceal his name, and to distinguish his composition by what motto he pleases; sending at the same time his name sealed up under another cover, with the motto inscribed upon it.

The Essay to which the prize shall have been adjudged will be read before the University, in the Divinity School, on some day in the week next before the Commemoration.

# CAMBRIDGE.

## DEGREES CONFERRED FROM JULY TO SEPTEMBER INCLUSIVE.

### DOCTORS IN DIVINITY.

*July 7th (being Commencement Day).*

Rev. William Dealtry, late Fellow of Trinity College, Rector of Clapham, and Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester.

Rev. Joseph Allen, late Fellow of Trinity College, Prebendary of Westminster.

Rev. Gilbank Ackland, St. John's College, Rector of St. Mildred's, Bread Street, and Lecturer of St. Andrews, Holborn, London.

Rev. Martin Joseph Naylor, late Fellow of Queen's College.

Rev. Samuel Thomas Bloomfield, Sidney College, Vicar of Bisbrooke, Rutland.

### DOCTORS IN PHYSIC.

*July 7 (being Commencement Day).*

Henry Shuckburgh Roots, Jesus Coll.

George Shaw, Caius College.

Richard Pinckard, Caius College.

John Burdett Steward, Pembroke Coll.

### MASTERS OF ARTS.

*July 7 (being Commencement Day).*

<p><b>DOWNING COLL.</b>  William Gurdon  William Ford Bally  Alfred Power</p> <p><b>JESUS COLL.</b>  William Goodwin  Henry Wm. Crick  James Hayes Sadler  Harvey Bawtree  William Warren  James Carver  E. Richard Otter  George Sharland  William Steggall  George Otter  R. M. Baddeley</p> <p><b>CAIUS COLL.</b>  Richard Day  F. Offley Martin  Robert Willis  Wm. Henry Hanson  Henry Clinton  Samuel Stone  Thomas Hulton  Charles Dade  Charles Paul  G. Oakes Miller  H. Beaumont Leeson  J. Theoph. Debrisay  John Day Hurst</p> <p><b>KING'S COLL.</b>  G. O. Townshend  W. Gifford Cookesley</p> <p><b>TRINITY COLL.</b>  John Bishton  Robert Maitland  Henry Collins  John Hodgson  William Law  Marmaduke Prickett  Henry Ashington  Francis Ford Pinder  W. Margetson Heald  Evan Jenkins  Richard Atkinson</p>	<p>William Hopwood  Charles Nairne  William Mason  Markland Barnard  Robert H. Lewin  William Webb  John Dixon Hales  R. Bourne Baker  James Darnell  J. B. Bulmer Clarke  Henry Peter Daniell  John Fitz-Gerald  Thomas Stratton  John Roach Bovell  G. Henry Bower  William Overton  Oswald Head  John Warner  E. Arthur Smedley  James Losh  G. Darby St. Quintin  David Ricardo  Charles J. Sympton  John Lane Freer  George Thornton  Pierce Morton  Edward Heneage  John Alex. Kinglake  James Allen  W. M. S. Marriott  Thomas Rawson</p> <p><b>ST. JOHN'S COLL.</b>  George Hepper  Gawen Hodgson  W. H. Ricketts Bayley  John Hymers  E. Bowyer Sparke  Henry Jesson  William Keeling  W. Hallows Miller  William Metcalf  J. A. Deverell Meakin  Rice Davies Powell  W. Rolph Richards  Samuel Revell</p>	<p>H. Reginald Yorke  Richard Foster  J. Lyneham Tanner  Benjamin Maddy  W. W. Robinson  John Henry Fludyer  J. Howard Marsden  John Pedder  W. L. Suttaby  Henry Fox  Edward Cole  W. Everest Stevens  F. H. Stoddart Say  G. H. Lee Warner  J. Henshaw Gregg  John Greensall  Josiah F. Flavell  Thomas Mee Gorst  John Henry Rowlatt  Frederick Jacob Hall  Frederick E. Grettton  Nathan Hubbersty  Thomas Hollway  Derwent Coleridge  Wm. Henry Foster  G. J. Philip Smith  Edward Gibson  Daniel Rose Fearon  Robert Lowe</p> <p><b>ST. PETER'S COLL.</b>  John Gautier Milne  William Stone  B. Franklin Couch  Samuel Hudson  R. Montagu Poore</p> <p><b>CLARE HALL.</b>  Thomas Bonney  John Champion  James Young Cooke</p> <p><b>PEMBROKE COLL.</b>  Robert South  Richard Trott Fisher  John Holt Simpson  John Wreford Budd</p>	<p><b>CORP. CHRISTI COLL.</b>  Wm. Milner Farish  John Bragg  Philip Booth  William Wells</p> <p><b>EMMANUEL COLL.</b>  Ralph Clutton  Alex. Henry Small  William Jones  George Ainslie  H. Prescott Blencowe  Charles Tyrell  Robert Wilson</p> <p><b>QUEEN'S COLL.</b>  James Rawlings  Thomas Bell  Thomas Clark  John Simons  John Harington  Nicholas Chinnery  Richard Gascoyne  Henry Bagnall  Thomas Ramshay</p> <p><b>CHRIST COLL.</b>  James Pedder  Charles Wallington  T. Sheldon Green  Barwick John Sams  Oliver A. Heywood</p> <p><b>SIDNEY COLL.</b>  John Gibson  Henry Alford  William Sykes  W. Bagshaw Harrison  George Gibbons  George G. Wyatville  Anthony Boulton</p> <p><b>CATHARINE HALL.</b>  John Gibson</p> <p><b>MAGDALENE HALL.</b>  George Marriott  T. Lovick Cooper  Thomas Husband  Theodosius Wood</p>
---	---	--	--

July 9.

Rev. Edward Cox, Trinity College,  
Thomas Newberry, Queen's College.

July 6.

Rev. William Spencer Phillips, B.D.  
late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, was  
admitted *ad eundem*.

Rev. Richard Greswell, M.A. Fellow  
and Tutor of Worcester College, Oxford,  
was admitted *ad eundem*.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

July 4.

Rev. John N. White, St. Peter's Coll.  
Rev. John Thomas, St. John's College.

BACHELORS IN CIVIL LAW.

July 4.

Rev. William Brown Hall, St. Peter's  
College.

July 6.

Rev. George Pocock, Trinity Hall.  
Harris Prendergast, Esq. Trinity Coll.  
Rev. A. B. Russell, Eminent College.

BACHELOR IN PHYSIC.

July 4.

Leonard Richard Willan, St. Peter's  
College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

July 4.

Charles Quayle Constable, Trinity Coll.  
Roger Smith, Magdalene College.  
William F. Raymond, St. Peter's Coll.

MISCELLANEOUS UNIVERSITY

INTELLIGENCE.

July 4.

A grace passed the Senate for the adop-  
tion of the following recommendation of  
the Syndics appointed to consider of the  
arrangements concerning the "Old Court,  
lately purchased of King's College."

"That they consider it necessary that  
provision should be made, not merely for  
a large increase of the accommodation of  
the Public Library, but likewise for four  
additional Lecture Rooms, for Museums  
of Geology, Mineralogy, Botany, and, if  
practicable, of Zoology, for a new office  
for the Registry, for an additional School  
for the Professor of Physic, and for other  
purposes connected with the despatch of

the ordinary business of the University :—  
That they consider the extent of ground,  
now the property of the University, inclu-  
ding the site of the present Library, as  
amply sufficient for all these objects :—  
That they consider it expedient to make  
application to four architects, for complete  
plans, elevations, and estimates, to be  
forwarded to the Vice-Chancellor, on or  
before the 1st of November next : and  
that the Syndicate should be authorised to  
give the necessary instructions ; to offer  
the sum of 100 guineas to each of the  
three architects whose plans shall not be  
adopted ; and to make a further report to  
the Senate before the end of the next  
term."

July 14.

Rev. Samuel Wilkes Waud, M.A. of  
Magdalen College, was elected a founda-  
tion Fellow of that society.

REPORT OF THE PREVIOUS EXAMINA-  
TION SYNDICATE.

The Syndicate appointed by Grace of  
the Senate, May 27, 1829, "to consider  
what alterations it is expedient to make in  
the mode of conducting the previous Exa-  
mination," beg leave to recommend to the  
Senate that the following plan of examina-  
tion be substituted for that now in force :—

\*1. That the previous Examination of  
the Junior Sophs in the Senate-House  
shall begin on the Monday in the week  
before the end of the Lent term in each  
year ; and that this examination shall  
continue throughout that week (with the  
exception of Friday) and during the Mon-  
day, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday  
of the week following.

2. That the subjects of examination shall  
be one of the four Gospels or the Acts of  
the Apostles in the original Greek, Paley's  
Evidences of Christianity, one of the Greek  
and one of the Latin Classics.

3. That the appointment of the parti-  
cular subject in the New Testament, and  
in regard to the two last-mentioned sub-  
jects, the appointment both of the authors  
and of the portions of their works which it  
may be expedient to select, shall rest with  
the Vice-Chancellor for the time being,  
the three Regii Professors of Divinity,  
Civil Law, and Physic, the Regius Pro-  
fessor of Greek, and the Public Orator  
(provided that not more than two of them  
are members of the same college) ; upon  
this clear understanding, that in the exer-  
cise of the powers thus to be vested in  
them they shall so limit the examination,

that every one who is to be examined may be reasonably expected to show a competent knowledge of all the subjects.

4. That in case three or more of those to whom the appointment of the subjects of examination has been assigned, shall belong to the same college, deputies for any number exceeding two shall be appointed, every year, by a Grace of the Senate.

5. That every person, when examined, shall be required: (1) to translate some portion of each of the subjects appointed as aforesaid; (2) to construe and explain passages of the same; and (3) to answer printed questions relating to the evidences of Christianity.

\*6. That previously to the commencement of the examination, the Examiners shall prepare an alphabetical list of all the persons to be examined, and divide them into equal portions according to the number of days of examination; and that they shall send a copy of such list to the Prælector of each college, notifying the day on which each of the persons to be examined belonging to that college shall be required to attend the examination.

\*7. That each of the persons to be examined shall be required to attend from eight o'clock till eleven in the morning, and from twelve o'clock till three in the afternoon on the day of which he has previously received notice.

\*8. That the persons to be examined each day shall be formed into two divisions; that each of these divisions shall be examined in the Greek subject by two of the Examiners, and in the Latin subject by the other two during the morning; and that the Greek Testament and Paley's Evidences shall be the subjects of examination in the afternoon.

\*9. That the persons under examination shall be employed in translating the passages, or answering the printed questions proposed, each individual being called upon in turn during the time of examination to construe and explain passages of the appointed subjects.

\*10. That in general the examination of each individual shall be concluded in one day, and that the result of each day's examination shall be notified as soon as conveniently may be to the Prælector of each college: but if the Examiners shall judge it expedient to examine any person further, in order to ascertain whether he shall be permitted to have a certificate of approval, they shall send notice of the day

on which his further attendance will be required.

\*11. That every Undergraduate shall be required to attend the examination in the year next but one after that in which he commences his residence.

12. That in case any one shall be prevented by illness (a certificate of which shall be submitted to the Vice-Chancellor and Proctors for the time being, for their approbation), from attending the regular examination of his year, he shall be required to attend the next following examination, and so on; and that, if any one shall absent himself upon any other account from the proper examination of his year, he shall not be allowed the term in which the examination takes place, and shall, moreover, be required to attend the examination of the next year, and so on.

13. That two classes (each of them arranged alphabetically) shall be formed out of those examined—the first consisting of those who have passed their examination with credit—and the second, of those to whom the Examiners have *only not refused* their certificate of approval.

14. That those who shall not be *approved* by the Examiners, shall be required to attend the examination of the following year, and so on; and that no degree of B.A. M.B. or B.C.L. shall be granted, unless a certificate be presented to the Caput, showing that the candidate for such degree has passed, to the satisfaction of the Examiners, some one of these examinations.

\*15. That public notice of the subjects of examination in each year shall be issued in the first week of the Lent term of the year preceding.

16. That, in every year, at the first congregation after the 10th day of October, the Senate shall elect four Examiners, (who shall be members of the Senate, and appointed by the several Colleges according to the cycle of Proctors and Taxors,) to conduct the examination of the succeeding year.

17. That each of the Examiners shall receive 20*l.* from the University chest.

18. That the foregoing regulations shall not interfere with the composition between the University and King's College.

\* The regulations, which contain deviations from those now in force, have an asterisk prefixed.

A grace for the adoption of the above recommendation will be offered to the Senate in the ensuing term.



COMBINATION PAPER.

PRIOR COMB.

- Agu. 2. Mr. Farbrace, Chr.  
 9. Mr. Gedde, Cath.  
 16. Mr. Howman, C. C.  
 23. Mr. Hutchinson, Jes.  
 30. Coll. Regal.  
 Sept. 6. Coll. Trin.  
 13. Coll. Joh.  
 20. Mr. Synge, Pet.  
 27. Mr. Sandys, Pemb.  
 Oct. 4. Mr. Chaplin, Clar.  
 11. Mr. Holditch, Cai.  
 18. Coll. Regal.  
 25. Coll. Trin.  
 Nov. 1. Coll. Joh.  
 8. Mr. Blyth, Chr.  
 15. Mr. Dunning, Regin.  
 22. Mr. Dale, C. C.  
 29. Mr. Whitaker, Emman.  
 Dec. 6. Coll. Regal.  
 13. Coll. Trin.  
 20. Coll. Joh.  
 27. Mr. Blackburn, Ch.

POSTER COMB.

- Aug. 2. Mr. Carnegie, Emman.  
 9. Mr. Heathcote, Trin.  
 16. Mr. Green, Regal.  
 23. Mr. Nicholas, Regal.  
 24. FEST. S. BARTHO. Mr. Oldfield, Joh.  
 30. Mr. Burroughes, Emman.  
 Sept. 6. Mr. Richards, Regin.  
 13. Mr. Croft, Trin.  
 20. Mr. Warren, Jes.  
 21. FEST. S. MAIT. Mr. Hind, Sid.  
 27. Mr. Harvey, Cath.  
 29. FEST. S. MICH. } Mr. Pope, Em.  
 } Mr. Peach, Joh.  
 Oct. 4. Mr. Attwood, Pemb.  
 11. Mr. Pearce, Jes.  
 18. FEST. S. LUC. Professor Henslow, Joh.  
 23. Mr. Studholme, Jes.  
 28. FEST. SS. SIM. ET. JUD. Mr. Greenwood, Cor.  
 Nov. 1. FEST. OM. } Mr. Skinner, Jes.  
 } Mr. Lunn, Joh.  
 8. Mr. Venn, Regin.  
 15. Mr. Courtenay, Joh.  
 22. Mr. Topham, Joh.  
 29. Mr. Evans, Joh.  
 30. FEST. S. AND. Mr. Wyat, Jes.  
 Dec. 6. Mr. Hett, Jes.  
 13. Mr. G. Ward, Trin.  
 20. Mr. Wingfield, Clar.

Dec. 21. FEST. S. THOM. Mr. Torlesse, Trin.

25. FEST. NATIV. Mr. R. H. Simpson, Trin.

26. FEST. S. STEPH. Mr. Tritton, Job.

27. FEST. S. JON. Mr. Coldwell, Cath.

28. FEST. INNOC. Mr. Tyson, Cath.

*Resp. in Theol.* *Oppon.*

Mr. Matthew, Trin. } Mr. Hett, Jes.  
 } Coll. Regal.  
 } Coll. Trin.  
 } Coll. Joh.  
 Mr. Feachem, Joh. } Mr. Lane, Magd.  
 } Mr. Walker, Regin.  
 } Mr. T. B. Wilkin-  
 } son, Corp. C.  
 Mr. Otter, Jes. . . . } Mr. White, Jes.  
 } Coll. Regal.

*Resp. in Jur. Civ.* *Oppon.*

Mr. Hustler, Jes. . . } Mr. Doughty, Cai.  
 } Mr. Clarkson, Jes.

*Resp. in Medic.* *Oppon.*

Mr. Stockdale, Pem. } Mr. Bond, Corp. C.  
 } Mr. Mair, Jes.

Singuli suo ordine concionabuntur, respondebunt, disputabunt, cæterisque exercitationes ipsi per se suâ in personâ præstabunt, nisi justa causa inciderit secundum Statuta approbanda.

Ad Conciones in Templo Beatæ-MARIÆ nullâ de causâ quisquam alterum sibi surroget, qui ad Concionem aliquam habendam omnino non sit (a principio ad finem circuli Combinationum) assignatus, sine expressâ licentiâ a Procancellario prius obtentâ, quo de ipsius gradu, sacris ordinibus, canonicâ obedientiâ, cæterisque requisitis constet Procancellario, antequam admittatur ad Concionem publicam.

G. AINSLIE, Procancellarius.

A Grace having passed the Senate to the following effect:—That those to whom the Sunday afternoon turns, and the turns for Christmas Day and Good Friday are assigned, shall, from the 10th of October, 1829, to the end of May, 1830, provide no other substitute than such as are appointed in conformity with that Grace:—The following persons have been elected, each for the month to which his name is affixed:

1829 *October*—Professor Musgrave, Trinity Coll.

November — Professor Scholefield,  
Trinity Coll.

December—Mr. Corrie, Cath. Hall.

1830 January—Mr. Evans, Trinity Coll.

February—Mr. Bowers, Clare Hall.

March—Mr. Rose, Trinity Coll.

April—Dr. Walton, Trinity Coll.

May—Mr. Pooley, St. John's Coll.

There will be Congregations on the following days of the ensuing Michaelmas Term :—

Saturday . . . . . Oct. 10, at ten.

Thursday . . . . Oct. 29, at eleven.

Wednesday . . . . Nov. 18, at eleven.

Wednesday . . . . Dec. 9, at eleven.

Wednesday . . . . Dec. 16, (end of term)  
at ten.

### PRIZES.

SIR WILLIAM BROWN'S MEDALS.

Subject (Greek Ode) :—

“ νήσαν, Αἰγαίη ὅσαι εἰν ἀλλ̃ ναιετάουσι.”

Adjudged to

Charles Rann Kennedy, Trinity College.

Subject (Latin Ode) :—

“ *Cæsar, consecutus cohortes, ad Rubiconem flumen, qui provinciæ ejus finis erat, paulum constitit.*”

Adjudged to

Charles Merivale, St. John's College.

Subject (Greek Epigram) :—

“ σκόπον δεδορκώς.”

Adjudged to

Charles Merivale, St. John's College.

Subject (Latin Epigram) :—

“ *Splendidè mendax.*”

Adjudged to

Charles Merivale, St. John's College.

### MEMBERS' PRIZES.

[Of Fifteen Guineas each, to two Bachelors of Arts, for the encouragement of Latin prose composition.]

Subject :—

“ *An putandum sit posthac fore ut gentes Meridionales sub Septentrionalium viribus iterum succumbant?*”

Adjudged to

George Langshaw, St. John's College.







